2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19 20

21

22

2.3

24

25

24

Suite 150, Princeton, New Jersey, commencing at 9:27 a.m. before Sharon L. Martin, RPR, CCR-NJ, Notary Public.

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

McCARTY, Ph.D., held at the Carnegie Center

Executive Suites, 300 Carnegie Center,

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Oral sworn deposition of NOLAN

April 14, 2016 Page 3

APPEARANCES: 1 3 PERKINS COIE BY: ELISABETH C. FROST, ESQUIRE 700 13th Street, NW Suite 600 Washington, DC 20005-3960 5 6 (202) 654-6256 7 efrost@perkinscoie.com 8 Counsel for the Plaintiffs 9 10 11 12 STATE OF WISCONSIN 13 DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE BY: GABE JOHNSON-KARP, ESQUIRE 15 16 17 W. Main Street 17 P.O. Box 7857 Madison, WI 53707-7857 18 (608) 267-8904 19 2.0 johnsonkarpg@doj.state.wi.us 21 Counsel for the Defendants 2.2 23 2.4 2 5

April 14, 2016

April 14, 2016

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

1	WITNESS INDEX	
2		
3	TESTIMONY OF: NOLAN McCARTY, Ph.D.	
4		
	EXAMINATION	PAGE
5		
6	By Ms. Frost	4
7		
8		
9		
10	EXHIBITS	
11		
12	EXHIBIT NAME DESCRIPTION	PAGE
13		
	McCarty-1 Journal article	19
14		
	McCarty-2 Expert report	32
15		
	McCarty-3 Nolan McCarty's Curriculum	42
16	Vitae	
17	McCarty-4 Article, Voting Costs and	68
18	Voter Turnout in	
19	Competitive Elections	
20		
21	McCarty-5 Rebuttal Report	169
22		
23		

(Exhibits attached to transcript)

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company

(866) 448-DEPO

Page 4 PROCEEDINGS 1 2 NOLAN McCARTY, Ph.D., having been duly sworn, was examined and testified EXAMINATION 6 7 8 BY MS. FROST: 9 Q. Professor McCarty, is it okay to 10 refer to you as Professor McCarty? 11 A. Yeah, better than Doctor. My name is Elisabeth Frost. I'm an 12 attorney with the law firm of Perkins Coie. 13 And I represent the Plaintiffs in this 14 15 matter. I know you've been deposed before. 16 But let's spend a few minutes talking about 17 some ground rules, just to make sure we're on 18 the same page. Okay? 19 20 A. Okay. 2.1 I will be asking you questions and you'll be answering them. And the court reporter will be writing down my questions and your answers. Your answers to my questions need to be audible to ensure an

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company

(866) 448-DEPO

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

23

24

25

Okav?

Α.

Okav.

Page 5

accurate record of the deposition. Okay?

A. Okay.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

2

7

8

9

10

1 1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

23

- Q. Please wait for me to finish my questions before your answer. This is also to make life easier for the court reporter. Okay?
  - A. Okay.
- Q. And I will do my best not to cut you off as well. And if it seems like I'm doing that, please let me know and I won't be offended. It's sometimes hard to transition from normal conversational patterns into a deposition pattern. Okay?
  - A. Okay.
- Q. Sometimes my questions will not be perfectly clear. I try and make them clear, but I'm not always successful. If I ask a question you don't understand, please tell me that you do not understand it and I will try and clarify. Okay?
  - A. Okay.
- Q. And, similarly, I find that in expert depositions often I use phrases that maybe the expert wouldn't use. The expert has a sense of what I'm saying, but it's not

## Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016

Page 7

- Q. And I may be able to get those documents. I have some here, but -- but we can work with that. Okay?
  - A. Okay
- Q. Sometimes it may happen that you answer a question as completely as you think you can and then later on, maybe minutes, maybe hours you realize, Oh, I would've liked to have expanded on that or added something or clarified. When that happens, let's just get that on the record, right there. Okay?
  - A. Okay.
- Q. Are you taking any medication of any kind which might make it difficult for you to understand and answer my questions today?
  - A. No.
- Q. Is there any reason you can think of as to why you will not be able to understand and answer my questions fully and truthfully today?
  - A. No.
- Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the political science literature that talks about people's decisions about whether to vote as a

you don't think is precise or accurate, that you tell me what you think I should be using. Okay?

And if I'm using terminology that

as precise as they would like, and I would

ask that you correct me in those situations.

A. Okay.

12 A. Yes

Q. That was a test.

If you need a break at any time for any reason, please say so. If you're in the middle of an answer, I will simply ask that you finish that answer, but then we can take a break. Okay?

A. Okay.

Q. If when you're answering you think of some documents that might help you remember the answer or give a more accurate answer, tell me. Okay? This isn't a memory test.

A. Okay.

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016 Page 8

April 14, 2016 Page 6

cost-benefit analysis?

A. Yes, I am.

Q. What's the general idea that the decision to vote is a cost-benefit analysis?

A. So the general idea is that voting carries some benefits. It carries the potential benefit of switching election outcome. And, therefore, the benefits, the probability of changing election outcome times the benefit of that outcome to the voter.

There's also other benefits, such as the benefit that accrues from fulfilling one's duty to vote. The benefit that accrues from, the social benefits that accrue from, you know, participating in a community action.

So those are the benefits.

And then a voter might weigh those against the costs, which include the cost of becoming informed, the cost of becoming registered, the cost of getting themselves to the polls and the costs of, the foregone opportunity cost of if they're voting and, therefore, they're not doing something else.

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

April 14, 2016

Page 10

Do you agree that as a general matter when the costs of voting rise, participation rates decline?

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2 23

24

25

1

2

7

8

9

10

1 1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1 9

20

2.1

23

- As a theoretical proposition, that's what this framework would apply, but it's an empirical question as to whether or not a particular change in ballots and procedures or electoral procedures measurably increase the costs of voting and whether or not voters are responsive to that particular change in cost.
- O. And when you say that's an empirical question, what exactly do you mean?
- I mean that we don't -- we have to observe how voters respond to changes, measure the extent to which they respond to changes and procedures in order to ascertain whether or not the cost was a significant deterrent to participation. Can't be answered in a -- it can't be answered in a theoretical way. It has to be taken to the data.
- So are you familiar with certain studies that are found when looking at particular data that when certain costs rise.

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016

Page 11

voting is a cost benefit, can be thought of as a cost-benefit analysis has some validity, but whether or not a particular change in a particular setting has an effect is a -- is an empirical matter that can't really be extrapolated from those previous studies.

- And have you ever yourself done any analysis about whether particular changes themselves in election laws have caused participation rates to decline?
- Yes, I was an expert witness in the case, the Ohio Democratic Party versus Husted

(Reporter clarification.) THE WITNESS: Husted.

H-u-s-t-e-d, where a similar -- mostly changes in the period of early voting, as well as some changes in the process of absentee balloting, whether or not that affected turnout overall and among minority groups.

- So how did you analyze that in that case?
  - I analyzed that by obtaining the Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company

(866) 448-DEPO

23 24 25 Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. 1 2 predict the race of each individual. the changes in the rules, with 2014, the most 8 9 10 Ο. 11 aggregate or individualized data? I used individual data. 12 Okay. And when I say "aggregate or 13 14 me to be asking about? 15 When you're referring to individual 16 data, it's that the kind of basic unit 17 analysis is a particular voter and 18 information as to whether he or she voted. 19 When you're referring to aggregate data, 20 2.1 you're looking at the percentage of people who vote in some kind of geographic unit, like, county, municipality, ward, precinct, 23 24 census track, census block.

> Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

25

Okay. Outside of the expert

2 Yes. You know, there are certainly procedures, changes that measurably increase 3 4 the costs and, therefore, might reduce turnout. 5 6 O. And can you give me some examples of those? There are -- so there's a lot of 8 studies showing that on rainy days there's 9 10 less turnout, presumably because the cost of 11 voting is higher, because it's more 12 unpleasant to go to the polls, stand -- stand in line. There are -- you know, there are 13 cross-state studies that correlate participation rates with things like 15 16 registration policies and other things like 17 that. Looking at the wide variation in 1.8 voting policies and correlating that across 19 states. So we have some principal, you know, 2.0 change in electoral rules, could enhance the 21 2.2 Other features of the electoral system in terms of mobilization and so forth can increase or decrease the cost of voting. So -- so, clearly, the idea that April 14, 2016 Page 12 Ohio voter file. And then Ohio, like Wisconsin, does not ask voters their race. So I used some statistical procedures to

participation rates decline?

then I compared voting turnout behavior between 2010, the previous election before

similar election after the change in the

- And in doing that, did you use
- individualized data, " what do you understand

1.8

2.0

2.2

April 14, 2016

Page 14

Page 1

witness work that you did in Ohio, have you yourself ever analyzed whether the costs of a particular election change have caused participation rates to decline?

A. I've done work on turnout and participation. I've not done specific evaluations of particular election law changes.

1 2

1.8

2.0

1 9

2.1

- Q. And when you say you've done work on turnout and participation, what has that work been about?
- A. That work has been about kind of long-term trends in the relationship between income, and citizenship, and voting in national elections.
- Q. Can you give me a more specific example of some of your work in this area?
- A. So my work in that area uses the census current population study, which asks questions each November about turnout. And I've used that study to look at the relationship between income and voting; Do higher income individuals vote more often than lower income voters? That fact is something that's well-documented, but my work

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016

Page 15

first place, then it would not have an effect on turnout. If it's a small change in cost of people that are very likely to vote, then it would not have a very large change in turnout. So it would have to be a very -- it would have to be a change in cost to the marginal voters, somebody who's more or less indifferent between voting and not voting.

And since we need data to assess who's a high income vote -- who's a high-propensity voter, who's a low-propensity voter, who the marginal voter is, what the change in costs are, whether it's likely to hit those people for which they're roughly indifferent between voting and not voting, it's just very hard to say from first principles, whether or not a particular change should have a substantial impact on turnout.

Q. So when you say a small change of costs on people very unlikely to vote is unlikely to have, and I don't want to put words in your mouth, but are you saying it's unlikely to have a significant effect on voter turnout or any effect on voter turnout?

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO is basically to look, to see whether there -there was a trend in that area; whether it
was increasingly true that high income
voters were increasingly more likely to vote
than lower income voters.

- Q. So when you say that fact is more -- is well-documented, you mean the fact that higher income voters are more likely to participate in elections than lower income voters?
- A. Yes. That's true, yes.
- 12 Q. Okay. And you agree with that 13 statement?
  - A. Yeah, that is true.
  - Q. Now, I understand that it's an empirical question, but I -- as I'm -- in a -- as a general matter, is it possible that small changes to the cost-benefit calculation can have significant effects on turnout rates?
  - A. In theory, in theory, in theory, it's possible. But it -- the effect of a small change in the cost depends on lots of factors. If it's a small change in cost of people who are very unlikely to vote in the

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016

Page 16

A. Well, taking the extreme, if there's a person who's not going to vote irregardless of the costs, then it has -- no, it has no, it has no impact. Strictly speaking, if it's someone who's going to vote irregardless, it's going to have no impact. The only way it would have any impact is if it hit the kind of the disproportionate hit,

- 9 the marginal voters, the people who are, you 10 know, on the fence about voting or not 11 voting.
  - Q. As an analytical matter, how do you identify those people who are never going to vote, irregardless of the costs?
  - A. Typically, a political scientist estimates statistical models using known correlates of voting behavior, and can estimate statistical models predicting whether or not someone is likely to vote or
- Q. And is that an individualized assessment or an aggregate assessment?
  - A. Well, any time -- I mean, you can be using -- you can be doing it on individual data or aggregate data, but any time you're

2

1

2

7

8

24

25

Page 18

using a statistical model, it's a -- it's essentially about averages and predictions that individuals may vary and may deviate from the model. So, you know, any statistical model is going to carry some amount of imprecision and error.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2 23

24

25

1

2

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1 9

20

2.1

23

2 4

- Do you have a sense as to in Wisconsin how big a percentage of the voting age population is unlikely to ever vote, regardless of the costs?
- No, I don't -- I don't have a -- I don't have a calculation of that sort. You know, we know that, you know, in, say, the very prominent Presidential elections of 2008, 2012, you know, the highest turn -- the highest turnout overall in recent U.S. history, I don't believe that the turnout rate, I don't want to say -- I don't want to say what it was. It was only -- it was somewhere in the 70s, so one can imagine there is probably a substantial set of people who even under the most ideal circumstances
- And do you have an idea as to what percentage of the voting age population of

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

for voting chose not to vote.

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016

Page 19

statistical studies about whether or not a particular intervention increased or decreased turnout.

- But you would agree that in a close election, an increase or decrease of turnout of only a matter of points can make a major difference in the outcome of the election, correct?
- Well, by definition, if an election would otherwise be tied, then, you know, any person who didn't vote would switch that election. But there's so many thousands of factors that go into participation turnout, and one would be very hard pressed to state that a particular change in election law was the -- was the cause of a changed election outcome.
- I'm going to hand you a document that I'm going to ask the court reporter to mark as McCarty Deposition 1.

(Exhibit McCarty-1, Journal article, is marked for identification.) BY MS. FROST:

Q. Okay. Professor McCarty, if you could take a look at the document that was

9 10 published? 11 Α. The Quarterly Journal of Political 12 Science. Ο And when was it published? 13 Α. 2012. 14 And in 2012, did you have any 15 16 Political Science? 17 Yes, I was one of the Editors in 18 Chief. 19 And how many editors did the 20 2.1 Quarterly Journal of Political Science have --

voters that you were just talking about? Well it's hard to pinpoint exactly 3 4 what the marginal range would be for a cost change for which the magnitude is uncertain. 5 But, you know, for example, there might be a 6 20-point swing between a Presidential election and a -- and a mid-term election. 8 And, therefore, you know, is a -- is a first 9 10 order. You know, there tend to be people who 11 are responsive as to whether or not there's a 12 Presidential election on the ballot or not. But that's a huge change, I would argue, in 13 the cost-benefit calculation, because most 14 people see the primary benefit and interest 15 16 in voting as being participating in the 17 Presidential election. 1.8 So, you know, even if I said there 19 was 20 percent of the people who are on that kind of margin, we're talking about for a 2.0 very big change in the electoral context. 21 What the size of the marginal population 2.2 23 would be for a very small change in election law is just something I don't know. And, 24 25 therefore, one has to rely on, you know, Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Wisconsin falls into that marginal range of

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

Page 20

April 14, 2016

just handed to you, can you tell me what this document is?

- This is a document, it's a journal article on voter ID laws.
- And what's the title of the journal article?
- Can Voter ID Laws be Administered in a Race-Neutral Matter.
  - And where was this article
- association with the Ouarterly Journal of
- I believe --23
  - -- at that time?
    - -- at the time they had four,

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company

(866) 448-DEPO

2

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

Page 21

either -- there two -- two editors in chief and four other subfield editors.

- Q. And when you say subfield editors?
- A. So political science tends to be subdivided into American politics, comparative politics, international relations and political theory.
- Q. So which subfield editor would have been responsible for this article --
  - A. American politics.
- Q. And I think we're stepping on each other a little bit. So just if you could wait a second.
  - A. Oh, okay.
- Q. Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

25

1

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

1 4

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

23

In your role as Editor in Chief, did you generally review and comment on the articles that -- that -- I'm going to call it OJPS; is that okay?

- A. That's perfect.
- ${\tt Q.} \qquad {\tt Okay.} \quad {\tt Published \ prior \ to \ the}$   ${\tt publication?}$
- A. So let me just outline the -- the process.
  - Q. Okay, please.

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016

Page 23

get many, many submissions and publish a number of papers. So I don't have any specific -- I don't have any specific knowledge of what I might have thought of the paper when it went out. I -- I certainly would not have published it had I not thought the analysis was sound and if it did not have a good strong endorsement from the outside peer reviews and the subfield editor.

- Q. Okay. If you can look at the first page of this article and you see the last line of the acknowledgements, Finally, we thank the QJPS editors and an associate editor for their detailed comments.
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Is it fair to say that it sounds like the QJPS editor, you would have been one of those editors?
  - A. Yes, that's -- that's correct.
- Q. And does this refresh your recollection that you offered detailed comments on this article?
- A. It doesn't -- it does not reflect my recollection, because the way things would work is that an associate editor would often

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

A. So upon -- upon submission, I and the other co-editor in chief would review the article and then assign it to a subfield editor. The subfield editor would obtain the -- would obtain the outside peer reviews and then would, upon obtaining them would make a recommendation to the Editorial Board as to whether or not an article should be published or not.

And then at that time I would have

And then at that time I would have reviewed the article on that outside peer reviews and decided whether or not to accept the recommendation of the subfield editor.

- Q. So if I'm hearing you right, it sounds like there are at least two points during this process when you have reviewed the article, and make it to some sort of decision as to whether the article would go forward; is that correct?
- 20 A. That is correct, yes.
- Q. Okay. Do you remember reviewing and commenting on this article?
- A. I do not. I mean, I'm sure that
  I -- I'm sure that I did. I have some
  recollection of the paper. But, you know, we

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016

Page 24

April 14, 2016

Page 22

write up the comments and then they would 1 2 come out oftentimes under cover of a letter from the editors. So sometimes I would add comments, sometimes I would subtract comments. But to the extent to which I 6 offered substantial comments, I just don't 7 know, because -- and they wouldn't have 8 known. So, you know, it doesn't really tell 9 me how engaged I was in this particular 10 manuscript.

- Q. But if you would add or subtract comments, that indicates to me that you read the comments before they went out; is that correct?
- A. Oh, yeah. Yeah. No, I read -- I read the comments. I may well have drafted -- I may well have drafted the letter, but whether or not the gist of the comments were produced by me or by the associate editor, it's just something I don't recall
- Q. Okay. Let's turn to page 4 of Exhibit 1, please.

And do you see the second -- I'd like to draw your attention to the second

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

1

2

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

23

24

Page 2

full paragraph where it states, Because of the obvious partisan consequences of the stringency of ballot access laws generally; do you see that line?

A. Yes.

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

11

13

15

16

17

1

7

8

9

10

1 1

12

13

1 4

15

16

17

18

19

2.1

23

24

- Q. Do you agree that the stringency of ballot access laws can have partisan consequences?
  - A. In theory, yes.
- Q. Let's continue to look at the same sentence on page 4, the beginning of the second full paragraph. And do you see where it says, as well as the incentives partisans have to manipulate the composition of the electorate?
- A. I'm sorry. Where, where are we again?
- 1.8 It's the same paragraph, the one 19 that begins. Because of the obvious partisan consequences of the stringency of ballot 2.0 access laws generally and ID requirements in 21 particular. And I'd like to draw your 2.2 23 attention to the second part of that sentence that reads, as well as the incentives 24 25 partisans have to manipulate the composition

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016

Page 27

particular context that incentive is permitted to be acted upon, I would say

- Q. And what types of political partisans have an incentive to manipulate the composition of the electorate?
- A. Presumably those who would like to run and win office.
- Q. Okay. So it could include members of the State Legislature who enact election laws?
  - A. Perhaps, yes.
- Q. And it could include local elections officials?
- A. Perhaps. But, again, depending on how those electorate -- election officials are chosen and professionalized.
- Q. And what are some of the incentives that political partisans might have to manipulate the composition of the electorate?
- A. I'm sorry. What do you mean by what incentives?
- Q. Why would -- I mean, it's -- it's obviously a fairly obvious proposition, but I'd like --

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO of the electorate.

A. Yes, I see that.

- Q. Do you agree that partisans have incentives to manipulate the composition of the electorate?
  - A. In principle, yes.
- Q. Let's turn to page 29 of Exhibit 1, please. I'd like to draw your attention to the last line in the first full paragraph on that page which reads, Further, United States elections are administered by political partisans who have powerful incentives to manipulate the composition of the electorate.

Do you see that sentence?

- A. Yes, I see that sentence.
- Q. Do you agree that United States elections are administered by political partisans who have powerful incentives to manipulate the composition of the electorate?
- manipulate the composition of the electorate?

  A. It -- it varies, the extent to

  which partisanship plays a role. And

  election administrations is obviously going

  to vary, be contextual. Partisans have an

  incentive perhaps to manipulate the

  composition of the electorate. Whether in a

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016 Page 28

April 14, 2016 Page 26

A. Yes.

Q. The question is, why would a political partisan might want to manipulate the composition of the electorate?

- A. Well, if the -- if the composition of the electorate had gave them advantages for winning office through increasing the size of their constituencies or decreasing the size of other constituencies, that would benefit them.
- Q. Okay. So how might the composition of the electorate be manipulated to serve Republican partisan interests?

Or to put it in your words, how might a Republican partisan increase or decrease the size of the Republican electorate?

MR. JOHNSON-KARP: Object to

form.

THE WITNESS: I mean, the way in which any party would get an advantage would be to find ways to get their partisans to turn -- make it easier for their partisans to participate and more difficult for the other partisans to participate.

2

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

24

25

BY MS FROST.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

1 2

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

1 9

20

22

23

24

- Okay. And what types of voters tend to support Republican candidates?
  - Republican voters.
- Can you give me any information about the typical demographics of Republican voters?
- Typically, Republican voters are Α. somewhat higher income. Somewhat more educated, except they're less likely to have a college degree than Democratic voters, but more likely to have -- more likely to have a post-high school education. They tend to be whiter. They tend to live in suburban rural areas. They tend to be more socially conservative. They tend to be econom -- more economically conservative.
- What about age, does age factor into the Republican electorate at all?
- I believe, yes, that Republican voters tend to be older.
- What, in your opinion as a political scientist, would be the best evidence that laws were passed with the intention of manipulating the composition of

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D April 14, 2016

Page 31

intent?

- I believe that the laws that passed were partisan. I mean, obviously the votes were partisan. Whether or not that was explicitly with the purpose of decreasing the turnout of opposition groups or simply because the Republican party nationally has made ballot security a key part priority, I couldn't -- I couldn't tell you.
- Are you aware of recent statements made by Wisconsin politicians and aides of former Wisconsin politicians that have publicly acknowledged that the intent was, in fact, to suppress certain types of voters?
- No. I'm not aware of those 15 Α. statements. 1.6
  - Now, you do state in your report that you can evaluate the available evidence of whether there was any partisan effect, correct? Actually, you know what, scratch that. Let's -- I'll give you your report. I'm not going to --
  - -- ask you to remember a sentence in the middle of the report.

the electorate to serve partisan interests?

The best evidence would be that

April 14, 2016 Page 30

April 14, 2016

- there was a change in the laws that was 3 4 promoted by one party. And that that resulted in a measurable change in election 5 outcome through either increasing the turnout 6 of the favored party or decreasing the turnout of the opposed party. 8
  - What if you had statements from Legislatures who enacted the law, saying they were meant to make it harder for certain types of voters to vote; would that be good evidence?
  - That may be evidence that there was some intent. I'm not sure that that would necessarily be evidence that the procedure that they chose had effectively done what they thought it was going to do.
  - Now, you don't offer an opinion in your report or in this case at all about whether the laws at issue were passed of partisan intent. do vou?
- 23 A. No. I don't.
  - Do you have an opinion as to whether these laws were passed of partisan

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

Page 32 Okay. 1 2 I am handing you a document that I will ask the court reporter to mark as McCarty Exhibit 2. And I'm going to do you a favor and give you the one that's not going to poke a hole in your finger, because I 7 stapled some of these wrong. This one, though, you have to be careful. 8 9 (Exhibit McCarty-2, Expert 10 report, is marked for identification.) 11 BY MS. FROST: 12 Do you have the document that's heen marked as Exhibit 22 13 Α. Yes. I do. 14 And can you tell me what that 15 document is? 16 17 It's my expert report in this case. I'd like to draw your attention to 18 page 5 of this report. 19

(Off-the-record discussion.)

20 BY MS. FROST:

2.1

23

24

25

I actually misspoke, I'm sorry, it's not page 5 that I want you to look at. It's the bottom of page 19.

> Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Do you see the beginning, the

Case Na: 1.5 mcM = 00324 - jdp Apr Dockiment #: 163 Filed: 05/09/16 Rage 29, af 53

2.2

23

24

2.5

1

2

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

23

24

25

Ο.

sentence that gets cut off at the bottom of page 19, While it is beyond the scope --Ves

- -- of my report to assess claims about partisan intent, I can evaluate the available evidence of whether there was any partisan effect.
  - Yes.

Δ

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

17 1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

8

9

10

1 1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

Okay. And then the next line that says, Ideally, one would like to have data on individual voter partisanship.

And then I'm jumping on the next line, Without individual data, I have, I assume "tested" is what you meant to say?

- Or -- or "to test."
- "I have to test, " okay, for partisan effects in a more indirect way using aggregate data.

Do you see that line?

- Ves Δ
- Ο. Okav. So to do this, to test the partisan effect of these laws, you looked at the 2010 and 2014 gubernatorial elections; is that correct?
  - That's correct, ves.

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016

Page 35

correlation between Republican and the Walker vote was very high. It was reported in the Lichtmann vote. So I focused on whether -the extent to which there was any effect on the Walker vote as a more or less proxy for whether it would have had a Republican advantage.

I mean, the extent to which -again, in the hypothetical world, the extent to which politicians might want to manipulate election outcomes make it easier for their top of the ticket candidate to win would be in the top of their priority list. So if you don't find an advantage accrued by the partisan candidate at the top of the ballot, suggests to me that's a pretty good test to whether there was a partisan effect.

- Can you identify any literature for me that endorses that methodology for analyzing partisan effect?
- While we often -- I mean, it's quite standard in political science to -- to look at voting behavior. Voting behavior is almost always for a particular candidate. So it would be hard for anybody to say there's

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Page 34 And both elections involve the same 1 2 Republican candidate for Governor, correct? 3 Yes 4 Ο. And that was Scott Walker? Yes. 5 Do you know how many of the people 6 7 who voted for Walker in 2010 identified as Republicans? 8 Α. No, I don't. 9 10 Do you know how many of the people 11 who voted for Walker in 2014 identified as Republicans? 12 Α. 13 14 Do you know how --I'm aware it's reported in Alan 15 16 Lichtmann's response to me, but I don't... 17 THE COURT REPORTER: In whose 1.8 response? 1 9 THE WITNESS: Alan Lichtmann. L-i-c-h-t-m-a-n-n. 2.0 BY MS. FROST: 21

> Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

at -- I did not look at that. The -- the

looked at when you did this analysis?

But that's not something that you

No, I did not. I did not look

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016 Page 36

April 14, 2016

something about partisan effect that's separate from the electoral effect. I mean, the goal -- I mean, in the hypothetical world of electoral manipulation, the goal is to elect candidates, not necessarily just to turn out partisans. think it's actually the most obvious thing to check, would be to see whether it was a change in the vote share of the candidate that was at the top of the ticket of the party who was responsible for a change in the

- But certainly in the real world. not the hypothetical world, a lot can happen to influence the way voters behave in elections, correct?
  - A. Oh, sure. Sure. absolutely.
- Q. And in the real world, people don't always vote for Republican candidates in every election, correct?

A person who votes for a Republican candidate in one election, may not vote for a Republican candidate in the next election, correct?

That's true. But the correlation

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

April 14, 2016

Page 38

```
is very high. And it's been growing for --
1
2
    been growing for decades. So ...
             But you don't know how many of the
3
    voters who voted for Walker in 2010 regularly
4
5
    vote Republicans up and down the ticket?
             No, no, I do not. I do not know.
6
             And you don't know how many of the
    voters who voted for Walker in 2014 regularly
8
9
    vote Republicans up and down the ticket?
             No, I do not know, do not know
11
    that --
             And what do --
             -- specifically.
13
             What do political scientists mean
    when they refer to a crossover voter?
             They refer to someone who is in one
16
    party and votes for a candidate of another
17
1.8
19
        Ο.
             And you don't know how many of the
    voters who voted for Walker in 2010 were
2.0
    crossover voters?
21
            T do not. no.
        Α.
2.2
            And you don't know how many of the
23
    voters who voted for Walker in 2014 were
24
    crossover voters?
25
```

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Presumably, there were. And there were 14 presumably ones who voted against him, who 15 voted for him. But all I can deal with, all 16 any statistical model can deal with is the 17 1.8 averages. 19 You don't know how many new voters voted in 2014 that hadn't voted at all in 2.0 Walker's last election? 21 I know the aggregate increase in --2.2 I know the aggregate increase in turnout and 23 I report that somewhere in my report. 24 presumably, that would be some reflection of 2.5 Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

No. I don't know that

voters who voted for Walker in 2010 were

voters who voted for Walker in 2014 were

No, I don't know that.

same voters who voted for Walker in 2010

I do not know that.

independent voters?

independent voters?

voted against him in 2014?

You don't know how many of the

You don't know how many of the

And you don't know of any of the

I don't know that specifically.

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016 Page 39 people who did not vote in 2010, who then did 1 It would be some reflection, but you don't know how much? Okay. Could you repeat the question, please? 7 How many --8 Because I thought it was a perfect 9 reflection. 10 Ο. How many new voters voted for 1 1 Walker --12 Α. Okav. -- in 2014 --13 Ω Okay. 1 4 Α. -- that hadn't voted in the 2010 15 gubernatorial election at all? 1.6 Okav. That, I do not know. I -- I 17 know the number of new voters. 18 Okay. Let's take a look at page 22 19 of your report. And I'm looking at Figure 1, 20 the scatter plot there. Do you see that? Can you tell me -- there's some 23 large circles in the lower left-hand part --Yes.

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company

(866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016 Page 40 -- quadrant of this scatter plot. 1 Can you tell me what those large circles represent? Okay. As indicated in the report, the -- all of the dots in this figure are 7 sized proportionately to the number of voters in the given municipality. So the very large 8 9 circles would be the very largest municipalities. So, presumably, Milwaukee, 10 11 Madison. 12 Q. Okay. And where is Green Bay in this scatter plot? 13 I have no idea. 14 Okav. Where is Kenosha? 15 I have no idea. 16 Did you weight the data used in 17 this scatter plot or is it unweighted? 18 I think I will need you to clarify 19 Α. 20 what you mean. 2.1 You don't know what I mean when I No, no, I -- weighted the data used 23 in the scatter plot, I mean, is not a -- if you can be more specific about what you're

asking. 2 Ο. Did you weight the data that you used in this analysis? 3 Yes. So the regression that was 4 reported involved weighting by the size of 5 the municipalities. The line, the dashed 6 line is estimated, weighting the data by the size of the municipalities. 9 Okay. And I must have missed that 10 in your report. Where in your report does it 11 say that you weighted it? The solid line in Figure 1 represents the best fitting linear 13 relationship between the two sets of vote shares (weighting by the number of 2010 2010 15 16 votes.) 17 So it's the first line of the third 1.8 full paragraph on page 21. 19 Okay. Thank you. Okay. Let's take a step back. 2.0 How many times have you served as 21 an expert witness? 2.2 So I've -- this will be my fifth 23 case. I believe I don't -- if you have my

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

C.V., I can make sure I'm not forgetting

24

25

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016

Page 43 recent. 1 2 And can you show me where on your C.V. are you looking at? The last page, page 12. I count five. There's another case, the Northeast Coalition for the Homeless versus Husted in 8 Ohio. I actually started, more or less finished that case since then and the C.V. And... 10 1 1 Ο. And so that was number 5 and number --12 That was number 5 and this will be 13 number -- this will be number 6. 14 Okay. If you don't mind just 15 letting me finish asking my question. 16 Okay, sure. 17 Thank you. 18 Let's talk very just briefly about 19 each of these. Okay? So it looks like --20 are these in chronological order? I believe so, yes. So the first one, Romo v. Detzner, 23 who hired you in that case? The House of Representatives in the 2 5

> Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Page 42 something. 1 2 I'm handing you a document that I will ask to be marked as McCarty deposition 3 Exhibit 3. 4 (Exhibit McCarty-3, Nolan 5 McCarty's Curriculum Vitae, is marked for 6 7 identification.) BY MS. FROST: 8 Do you have the document that's 9 10 been marked as Exhibit 3 before you? 11 And what is it? 12 It's my Curriculum Vitae. 13 Okay. And we were talking about how many times you've served as an expert 15 witness. 16 17 Α. Yes. 1.8 Ο Does this help you remember how 19 many times you've served as an expert witness? 2.0 Α. Let me just make sure. 21 Take your time. 2.2 23 Yes. So. actually, this would be -- this will be number six. There's one 24 that's not on here, because it was very, very 25

April 14, 2016

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016 Page 44 State of Florida. 1 2 And what was the issue in that 4 The challenge to the congressional districting maps. And was the House of 6 7 Representatives of the State of Florida controlled by Republicans at the time? 8 9 10 ο. And did you write a report? 11 Yes, I did. Did you give a deposition? 12 ο. 13 Yes I did Did you testify in court? 14 Ο. 15 Α. Yes. Ο. Were you admitted as an expert? 16 Yes. 17 And how did the case turn out? 18 The congressional map, the 19 2 0 congressional maps were ordered to be 2.1 altered, moved back to the State Legislature to rem -- for a remedy. So the House of Representatives 23 24 lost that case? 25

2

that case?

April 14, 2016

And the House of Representatives 1 were the Defendants in that case? 2 Yes they were one of the 3 4 Defendants. 5 And I'm sorry, but wasn't the precise question in that case whether or not 6 7 the maps were an impermissible partisan gerrymander under the Florida Constitution? 8 9 Yes, that was what the case was 10 11 Let's talk about the second case. And, again, we're still looking at Exhibit 3, your C.V. and we're looking at the back page. 13 NAACP v. Husted, who hired you in that case? 15 Α. The Secretary of State, the State of Ohio. 16 17 Q. Is the Secretary of the State of Ohio an elected position? 1.8 19 Α. Yes. it is. And is the Secretary of State of 2.0 Ohio -- or was the Secretary of the State of 21 Ohio at that time John Husted? 2.2 23 Α. Yes. Is John Husted a Republican? 24 Ο.

> Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

2.5

Δ

Yes.

Δ 3 What was that case about? 4 Ο. My involvement in that case 5 revolved -- there may have been other issues. 6 My involvement was related around changes to 7 the early voting period in the State of Ohio. 8 And specifically what about those 9 changes to the early voting period? 10 11 They reduced the early voting period from something like 31 days to 25 days. 13 And what were you -- what did you 14 offer an opinion about, about that reduction? 15 I was a rebuttal witness to -- to 16 17 testimony that was offered that suggested that African Americans disproportionately 1.8 19 used early voting. Therefore, the reduction would disproportionately harm their access to 2.0 the ballot. 21 Did you write a report in that 2.2 Ο. 23 case? Yes, I did. 24 Α. Did you give a deposition? 25 Ο. Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

And Husted was the Defendant in

## Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016 Page 47 Yes, I gave a deposition. 1 2 Did you testify in court? No, the case was -- the case was Let's take -- let's talk about the third case. League of Women Voters of 7 Florida v. Detzner, who hired you in that 8 case? 9 The Florida State Senate. And was the Florida State Senate 10 11 controlled by Republicans at the time? Yes, they were. 12 Δ And what was that case about? 13 Ω It was about a challenge to the 14 State Senate Districting Maps, that they were 15 impermissibly partisan. 16 Again, under the Florida 17 Constitution? 18 Α. Under the Florida Constitution, 19 yes. 20 2.1 So a similar issue to the one in Romo v. Detzner? Α. 23 24 And did you write a report in that

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company

(866) 448-DEPO

	Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016
	Page 48
1	A. Yes, I wrote a report responding to
2	some simulation evidence provided by
3	Plaintiff's experts.
4	Q. Did you give a deposition?
5	A. No.
6	Q. Did you testify in court?
7	A. No.
8	Q. What was the outcome of that case?
9	A. The case was dropped. The State
10	Senate conceded that there was a problem and
11	went back and redid the maps.
12	Q. The State Senate conceded that the
13	map was an impermissible Republican
14	gerrymander and agreed to withdraw to
15	redraw the maps, correct?
16	MR. JOHNSON-KARP: Object to
17	form.
18	THE WITNESS: I'm not sure what
19	the State Senate conceded, but they did
20	decide to re redraw the maps.
21	BY MS. FROST:
22	Q. Was it your expert opinion in that
23	case that the State maps were not a partisan
24	gerrymander?
25	A. My testimony was in direct response

2.5

1

2

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

form

Page 50

to another expert report, which claimed that it was statistically very, very unlikely that the maps were drawn without partisan intent. I challenged the conclusion of that evidence and said that it was possible that the maps could have been drawn without partisan intent. I never weighed in as to whether or not they actually were drawn with partisan intent or not. It was just a direct response to statistical claims by Plaintiff's experts.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

1 4

15

16

17

18

1 9

20

2.1

23

- And similarly, just to go back to that Romo v. Detzner case, did you offer an opinion in that case that the Congressional map was not a partisan gerrymander?
- No. My conclusion was very similar to the State Senate case, that it just simply that -- that it would have been possible to have drawn such maps without partisan intent. I did not conclude whether or not partisan intent was a presence or not.
- And the Florida Supreme Court concluded in that case that the map was an impermissible Republican gerrymander. correct?

MR. JOHNSON-KARP: Object to

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016

Page 51

- And who held that position at the time that you were hired?
  - I believe it was Michael DeWine.
  - Is Michael DeWine a Republican?
  - Yes, he is.
  - What was that case about?
- This case was -- combined a number of challenges to changing Ohio election law. It kind of renewed the challenge to the change in early voting, and also dealt with some changes to procedures for absentee balloting.
- Did you write a report in that Ω case?
  - Yes, I did. Α.
  - Did you give a deposition? Ο.
- Yes, I did. Α.
  - Did you testify in court? Ο.
  - Yes. Α.
  - Was it your -- what -- what was, in ο. a nutshell, your expert opinion in that case?
  - My opinion in that case was that the evidence offered of a negative impact on minority voters was not solid. And that the statistical evidence of any detrimental

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

THE WITNESS: I don't remember 2 exactly what the overall conclusion was but 3 two districts were required to be redrawn. 4 BY MS. FROST: 5 Is that true after the case went to 6 the Florida Supreme Court? MR. JOHNSON-KARP: Object to 8 9 form. 10 THE WITNESS: No. Excuse me, 11 I'm sorry, I was -- I thought you were referring to the -- the Circuit Court 12 decision. No, the State Supreme Court 13 actually did rule that it was impermissible, as far as the gerrymander. 15 BY MS. FROST: 16 17 And let's -- just sort of moving down the list, we're still on Exhibit 3, the 1.8 19 Ohio Democratic Party v. Husted: who hired you in that case? 2.0 Α. The Attorney General. State of 21 Ohio. 2.2 23 And is the Attorney General in the State of Ohio an elected position? 24 Yes, it is.

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016

Page 52

effect was not -- was not valid.

Did you conclude there was no detrimental effect on minorities in Ohio as a result of those changes?

No, it's very hard to prove, the no effect. So in any time, one is using kind of quantitative scientific evidence, I think the best one can say is there's an absence of evidence for an effect. And that's what I found

- And that's similar to your opinions in this case, correct?
- Oh. absolutely.
- You're not offering an opinion in this case that there is, in fact, no effect on minority voters or any types of voters as a result of the challenged laws in this case?
- That's right. One can't logically use statistical evidence to prove the no effect. All one can do is say there's an absence of evidence for an effect, and that's what I'm testifying to.
- And then you said there's an additional case in which you have provided expert witness services that is not on your

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

16

25

1

2

3

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

23

24

Page 54

Page 5

C.V. and I believe you said the case name was Northeast Coalition for the Homeless versus

- $\hbox{A.} \qquad \hbox{I believe that's correct.} \quad \hbox{I may be} \\$  getting the acronym wrong.
- $\ensuremath{\mathtt{Q}}.$  Is that case also pending in the Federal District Court in Ohio?
- $\label{eq:A. Yes. As far as I know, it may} \mbox{ still be going on.}$ 
  - Q. They just had trial in that case?
- A. They just had trial. And I've even gotten word that they've wrapped up, so I don't know.
  - Q. And who hired you in that case?
- 15 A. The combination of the Secretary of 16 State and the Attorney General.
- Q. And, again, at that time, the Secretary of State was still John Husted?
  - A. Yes.

2

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

19

2.2

24

1

2

8

10

11

12

13

1 4

15

1.6

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

- Q. And the Attorney General was still
  Mike DeWine?
  - A. Yes, I believe so.
- Q. What was the case about?
  - A. That case dealt with procedures for absentee balloting. They required
    - Capital Paporting A Varitant Company

## Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016
Page 55

this case?

A. So I believe my -- the first contact was in late November of 2015. At the time, due to my schedule and the schedule of the case, we determined that I would not be able to participate. Then my understanding is that the timeline of the trial changed and so I was recontacted around the second week of December and then we determined that there would be time for me to file a rebuttal report.

- Q. And who contacted you?
- A. Clay Kawski.
- $\label{eq:Q.Briefly summarize} \text{ for me what you} \\$  think this case is about.
- A. What this case is about?

Well, it's about -- at least at the level which I've had to engage the details, it's about whether or not a package of changes to Wisconsin electoral law and procedure might have impacted disproportionately the turnout and participation of African Americans or might have had a partisan impact on subsequent elections.

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO addition -- they required additional pieces of information. It also involved procedures for approving provisional ballots.

Q. And what was your expert opinion in that case?

A. My expert opinion in that case is that the statistical evidence offered by the Plaintiffs was not sufficient to demonstrate that there had been a deleterious effect on

10 African Americans or other minority voters.

- 11 Q. Did you write a report in that 12 case?
- 13 A. Yes, I did.
  - Q. Did you give a deposition?
- 15 A. No, I did not.
  - Q. Did you testify in court?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. All right. And then the last one 19 is the one that you're here for today?
- 20 A. Yes.
- Q. And I know the answers to those questions, so I'm not going to ask them.
- A. See if I can do any better on this
  case than I did on recalling the other cases.
  - Q. When were you first contacted about

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016

Page 56

Q. And what were you asked to do in the context of this case?

A. I was asked to respond to the Plaintiffs' expert reports in -- with a particular focus on the issues raised in Professor Mayer's report.

- Q. How much time have you spent working on this case so far?
- A. I believe I've spent 34 hours, all told.
- 11 Q. And how much of that time was spent 12 preparing your expert report in this case?
  - A. Preparing the expert report?

    My guess is about 25 of those

hours.

Q. Are you pretty confident about that quess?

Pretty confident, pretty confident.

- I mean, obviously, some of the -- some of the total that I gave you involves consultations and other things. And that sounds about right.
  - $\ensuremath{\mathtt{Q}}.$  Are you aware that the Complaint in this case was recently amended to include allegations about the manner in which

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

2

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

23

24

Page 58

Wisconsin is implementing its voter ID law?

No.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

11

13

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

1

2

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1 4

15

16

17

18

1 9

20

2.1

23

25

Isn't it great, sometimes you say no and I just cross off a bunch of questions.

MR. JOHNSON-KARP: Do you want

to take a break?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, yeah, I think that would be great.

MS. FROST: Shall we take a

10 quick break? Okay.

(Brief recess.)

BY MS. FROST:

Professor McCarty, I am going to ask you to turn your attention back to your report that you prepared in this case, which has been marked for the purposes of this deposition, McCarty deposition Exhibit 2.

Do you have that document in front

- Δ Yes, I do.
  - Ο. Okay. Let's turn to page 5,

please.

of you?

2.2 23 I'd like to talk a little bit about your use of the 2010 and 2014 elections and 24 25 vour analysis, okay?

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016

Page 59

I know here, though, there's a difference, in that there was a Senate election in 2010, but not 2014. Other than that, they were very similar in terms of the ballot, the contested elections.

And the second is that, at least at the top -- the third point is that at least at the top of the ballot the outcomes were roughly similar.

- What do you mean by that, "at the top of the ballot the outcomes were roughly similar"?
- So the vote share obtained by the Republican candidate, Scott Walker, was approximately the same in both elections.
- And why is that important for the purposes of your analysis?
- Well, if there were lots of things that differed between the -- the two elections, such that, say, one election was a blowout and one was a squeaker, that could affect turnout, voters are more likely to vote in highly contested elections than less contested elections.

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company

(866) 448-DEPO

If there was a big partisan swing

Okay. Δ

Ο. So do you see -- the second sentence on page 5. do vou see where vou sav. There are many good reasons to focus on such a comparison.

And by "such a comparison," you appear to mean comparisons of turnout in 2010

- Yes, that's what I meant.
- 10 Okay. Can you tell me what those 11 many good reasons are?
  - Well, as I write, the first and perhaps the most important I guess underlies the strategy in Ken Mayer's report, is that the changes in Wisconsin electoral procedures were implemented over the interval between 2010 and 2014.
  - Ο. Okay. Are there any other good reasons?
  - Second, that they're roughly similar elections. Lots of things differ between Presidential elections and mid-term elections. So in comparison of two mid-term elections, seems to be most appropriate so that we're comparing apples and apples.

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016

Page 60

between the two elections, such that -- for reasons involving optimism, enthusiasm or whatever, one party turned out at very, very high rates and the other party had a disillusionment and disgust, don't have very low rates, other comparison wouldn't be so

So the fact that they're kind of reruns suggests that it's a fair task to see whether or not there was any impact in the change in laws.

- Does the fact that the vote shares between 2010 and 2014 remained virtually identical mean that the underlying dynamics of the election and the electorate were necessarily the same between those two elections?
- Not necessarily. It just means that if there were any dynamics that would have skewed one way, they were counteracted by dynamics that skewed in the other way. So they came out as equal. It's the same type of concern you would have with any kind of, you know, statistical analysis. We're only looking at the average effects. Average

other wav?

Α.

No, no. I just know that it

And, in fact, you admit on page 15

Now, as we discussed, both 2010 and

So how, if at all, does voter

Other -- not just a little lower,

Considerably, it's considerably

Okav. And I think earlier today

you had said, I mean, it could be as great as

I -- I -- yes, I said that, I

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company

turnout differ between mid-term elections and

appears they cancelled each other out if --

of your report, that relationships between

demographics and turnout may change from one election to the next for reasons unrelated to

if, in fact, they existed at all.

A. That is correct, yes.

That's correct, yes.

It tends to be lower.

2014 were mid-term elections?

Presidential election years?

right, substantial --

Δ

lower, ves.

voting laws, correct?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

2

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2 0

2.1

23

24

Page 62

effects were about the same, very similar. So I worry less about the idiosyncrasies of each -- each election, given that they at least in the outcomes turn out to be pretty similar.

Let's break that down a little bit. I want to make sure I understand what you're

You said that if something skewed, I'm not sure I guite caught that.

11 MS. FROST: Actually, could you read the beginning of his response back to 13

(At which time the following answer is read:

"ANSWER: Not necessarily. It just means that if there were any dynamics that would have skewed one way, they were counteracted by dynamics that skewed in the other wav.")

MS. FROST: That's fine.

Thanks. 23 BY MS. FROST:

1

2

3

8

9

10

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

25

1 2

8

10

1 1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

23

24

25

But you don't know what dynamics 24

skewed one way and what dynamics skewed the

# Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016

Page 63

believe that's pretty much correct.

Do you know how much of a difference you tend to see in voter turnout between mid-terms and Presidential elections in Wisconsin?

I've looked at that data. I -- I don't have it -- I don't have it memorized, but I have -- I have looked at it and it seems to be in that ballpark that I just described.

Other than the fact the turnout is considerably smaller in mid-term elections than in Presidential years, what differences, if any, have political scientists identified about the composition of the electorate in mid-term versus Presidential elections?

Mid-term elections tend to have more engaged voters. Kind of the idea is that people who are kind of less engaged in politics overall only choose to vote in Presidential elections. Mid-term electorates are probably -- well, definitely more educated, higher income, more Republican. I think those are the key differences. Is the mid-term electorate

> Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

a 20 point difference, correct?

April 14, 2016 Page 64

generally whiter than the Presidential electorate?

Yes, I believe so. Yes.

Now, you used this term earlier today, but I want to make sure I understand What is a low-propensity voter versus a high-propensity voter?

So a low-propensity voter would be someone who's very unlikely to vote.

Very unlikely?

Yes, very unlikely. Somewhat unlike -- I mean, I'm using it kind of generally to indicate someone who's not likely to vote.

Do we tend to see more low-propensity voters voting in Presidential election years than in mid-term election vears?

Α. Yes.

So they do --

In a relative term.

I mean, relatively low propensity. If they're extremely low propensity, no, because they don't vote in either election.

Page 66

Page 6

- Q. Are low-propensity and highpropensity voters impacted in precisely the same ways by vote treatment?
- A. Well, the high-propensity voter -- I'm sorry. Could you define what you mean by "vote treatments."
- Q. Well, it's a word I picked up from the literature. So you may have a better sense of it than I do. But my understanding -- well, have you heard the term "vote treatment"?
- A. Okay. I just wanted to make sure that you meant the same thing that I meant.
- Q. Why don't you tell me what you mean when you say "vote treatment."
- A. I would mean some change to election rules.
  - Q. Then that's what I mean, too.
  - A. Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

22

24

25

1

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

- Q. So I'll ask the question again, are low-propensity and high-propensity voters impacted in precisely the same way by vote treatments?
  - A. Presumably not.
  - Q. And, in fact, literature has shown

### Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016

Page 67

you know, you think about a voter's propensity to vote, on average for a typical election, how likely they would be to vote? Well, that's going to differ than their propensity voting in a specific election. And what we're calling electoral treatments will -- can only affect those who are on the kind of the margin. So it really depends on, it's a low turnout election, the marginal voter, the one who's just indifferent between voting and non-voting is going to be a higher propensity voter than would be the case if it were a very high turnout election, where the marginal voter is going to be -- tend to be a very low-propensity voter.

- Q. I think you just said the vote treatments can only affect people who are on the margin. I just --
- A. Well, I mean, it's only going to have an observable -- observable effect of people in the margin.
- Q. And by what you mean "people in the margin," again, are you talking about this in the same way you were talking about this earlier this morning, where you were saying

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

that low-propensity and high-propensity 1 2 voters are not impacted in the same ways by vote treatments, correct? 3 A. I think it would depend, I think it 4 would depend on what the vote treatment is. 5 Okay. For example, do 6 low-propensity and high-propensity voters respond the same way to get out the vote 8 treatments? 9 10 Again, it depends a lot on the --11 it depends a lot on the -- on the context. 12 But there are studies showing --Sure. And there are probably 13 studies showing -- showing opposite effects, depending on the -- on the context. If -- if 15 16 it's a low turnout election overall, then 17 high-propensity voters may be more responsive 1.8 to get out the vote treatments than 19 low-propensity voters. There's a very high 2.0 turnout election overall, then it's going to be low-propensity voters are on the margin 21 and, therefore, the get out the vote's going 2.2 23 to have a bigger impact on them. It just depends on the context. 24 You know, if you think about a --25

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016

Page 68

neither very low-propensity or high-propensity voters, you're talking about people in the middle?

- A. In the middle.
- Q. Okay. Sometime when I hear "margin," I think people on the sides.
  - A. Yeah. I -- you know, when I say that, I -- I know that might be confusing, but... And that's the way we kind of talk about it in terms of the cost-benefit analysis.
    - Q. Okay.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- A. When we do cost-benefit analysis we talk about the relation between the marginal benefit and the marginal cost, and the person for which that exact equal would be the one on the margin.

21 (Exhibit McCarty-4, Article,
22 Voting Costs and Voter Turnout in Competitive
23 Elections, is marked for identification.)
24 BY MS. FROST:
25 Q. Do you have Exhibit 4 before you?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

18

19

20

2.1

23

24

Exhibit 4.

Competitive Context.

think you say that word?

Linearities.

Α.

important ways.

Page 70

Yes I do Ο. And can you tell me what that exhibit is? It's an article called Voting Costs and Voter Turnout in Competitive Elections. And where was this article published? The Quarterly Journal of Political Science. And when was this article published? 2010. And were you the Editor in Chief of the Quarterly Journal of Political Science ---- in 2010? Ο. Α. Yes, I was one of the two Editors in Chief

2

3

4

8

9

10

13

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

1.6

17

18

19

20

2.1

23

Ο. Okay. Please let me finish my questions before you answer.

I thought I heard a question mark.

And that is my fault. Sometimes I have an upturn at the end that is not -- it is a -- it is faking you out. I apologize. Okav. Please turn to page 341 of

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016

Page 71

Now, when you analyzed turnout in this case, you used aggregate data only,

Of -- when I analyzed turnout? No.

You used individualized data?

I used the data provided from the voter file from Professor Mayer and evaluated his claims about turnout. And that would have been based on individual data.

Okay. Well, let's break this down, because I think maybe you did that in part of vour report, but I don't --

Α. Yes.

-- know that you did it in all of Ο. it. Okav?

No, that's -- that's correct, ves.

Okay. So if we turn to page 5 of your report, which is Exhibit 2 in this deposition, and I'm looking at the heading Section 2, Analysis of Turnout in 2010 and 2014. And that section runs for about a page and-a-half. And it ends at the line, In summary there is little-to-no evidence that

changes in Wisconsin electoral law depressed Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016 Page 72 overall turnout between 2010 and 2014; do you 1 2 see that on page 7? Yes. Okay. So for this section --All right. This -- this section is based on aggregate data, statewide totals. 7 So by using the aggregate data 8 only, you were not able to distinguish 9 between high-propensity and low-propensity 10 voters, were you? 11 No, that's -- that section had a very limited purpose, which was just to 12 demonstrate that contrary to the assertions 13 in various Plaintiffs' reports, turnout in 14 Wisconsin did not decline between 2010 and 15 2014. 16 17 Okay. So you may have intended it

to have a very limited approach, but I

actually think it says some interesting

things and I'd like to talk to you about

this article which has been marked as

And I would ask that you draw your

attention, please, to the first two sentences

underneath the heading, External Validity and

Do you see where it says,

Heterogeneous effects appear everywhere in

get-out-the-vote treatment can affect voters

Do you agree with that statement?

And going a little bit further down

These nonlinearities matter because

Do you agree with that statement?

with high latent propensities to vote more than those with low latent propensities.

into the paragraph, do you see the sentence

Linearities, thank you.

the magnitude of effects may be different

across types of individuals in substantively

that says, These nonlinearities -- how do you

studies of political behavior. A

So, first let's just start with this line that we were just talking about on page 7, There is little-to-no evidence that

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

2

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

turnout.

turnout?

Q.

Page 74

the changes in Wisconsin electoral law depressed overall turnout between 2010 and 2014 · do vou see that?

Yes, I see that.

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

15

16

1 7

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

1.6

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

And we've covered this a bit, but I just want to make sure I understand.

You write little-to-no evidence. You are not offering an opinion that the changes in Wisconsin electoral law at issue in this case did not depress turnout between 2010 and 2014, right?

- Yes, I'm arguing that there's an absence of evidence that it depressed it. One can hardly know what the counterfactual would have been absent those changes.
- And when you say, One can hardly know what the counterfactual would have been absent those changes, what you are saying, correct, is that you don't know whether turnout might have been even higher without those changes to election law, correct? That's -- that's -- that's correct.
- Although, I consider some possibilities. which is that there was an upward trend that was, sav, truncated by the laws, but there's

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

have not done work in that area?

April 14, 2016

Page 75

April 14, 2016

- On the evaluation of changes in election law to turn -- to turnout, no. However, the methodological issues involved in doing such analysis are quite similar to many other things that I've done in other areas of election law, such as the effect of reapportionment in gerrymandering.
- How is it similar to the effect of reapportionment in gerrymandering?
- Well, the statistical procedures you look at outcomes before an intervention or it can affect a -- a -- treatment. And you look at outcomes after and you evaluate the magnitude of the differences.
- And you do that based on aggregate data only?
- Well, in the case of -- in the case of reapportionment and redistricting, it has to be aggregated if you're looking at it -you know, the outcomes that you're interested in are aggregated. Like, how many seats go to which party.
  - Right.

But in -- in redistricting you're talking about voters being assigned to

(866) 448-DEPO

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company

Page 76 different districts, totally outside their own control, you're not talking about individual voter --

no evidence of an upward -- there's no

of -- of that conclusion.

Yeah.

bit about that in just a moment.

evidence of an upward trend before 2010.

it's not just simply the turnout went up.

That turnout went up was not the sole basis

Correct. And we'll talk a little

Do you consider yourself an expert

I have done some work on voter

What work have you done on voter

Work that we described -- that I

Okay. What about voter turnout in

I have not done academic work, but

So outside of your expert work, you

I have testified on that in the cases that we

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

described earlier in looking at long-term

and voting at the national level.

response to specific election laws?

changes in the relationship between income

discussed earlier.

Ο.

- -- behaviors?
- Yeah, I'm not talking about individual voter behaviors. So I'm not doing an evaluation, but the statistic -- the statistical processes for evaluating policy changes is essentially the same, whether you're talking about individual voters or aggregate outcomes, like gerrymandering.
- But you would agree that when you're talking about the ways that particular voting laws affect the electorate is a different question, because it turns on how voter behavior changes in response to those laws?

MR. JOHNSON-KARP: Object to 19 20

2.1 THE WITNESS: That is correct. But the procedure is to have a measure of voter behavior before the laws, a measure of 23 24 voter behavior after the laws and compare the differences before, pre and post.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

25

1

2

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

23

24

Page 7

BY MS. FROST:

Q. But when you're looking just at aggregate data, you're not looking at how an individual voter behaves before and after the law, you're just looking at the electorate as a whole, which you admit can change from election to election?

MR. JOHNSON-KARP: Object to

form.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

25

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

1 4

15

1.6

17

18

19

20

23

24

THE WITNESS: Yes, that's true. Although, individual behavior can change from election to election having nothing to do with the changes. So that's why we evaluate whether it's a change on average.

So the real question about individual versus aggregate is not about whether or not you'd want to evaluate it by comparing a pre and post, it's about whether you were concerned about aggregation bias associated with aggregating individual behavior to aggregate levels.

BY MS. FROST:

Q. So tell me about aggregation bias, what does that mean?

A. So aggregation bias refers to the

## Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016

Page 79

Q. Where is that?

- A. That's Section 4.
- Q. What page in Section 4, starting?
- A. It starts on page 19. So the turnout comparison actually is in Figure 2 on
- Q. But this isn't looking at it based on race, this is looking at it based on partisanship, correct?
- A. Oh, okay. I thought the question was more generally about whether I used aggregate data at the municipal level. Yes, I did, but not -- not -- not on race. I -- I misheard the question.
- Q. And would you agree that African American voters might behave differently in urban areas than they do in rural areas in response to changes in election laws?
- A. That's -- that's -- that's possibly true, but would -- would they act differently than whites in rural areas or whites in urban areas is the question that we'd want to know.
  - Q. But you didn't ask that question?
- A. I didn't -- I did not ask that, I did not ask that question.

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO fact that there are logical reasons to be concerned about drawing inferences about individual behavior from aggregate behavior. So, for example, suppose you saw a decline in turnout in heavily African American municipalities. One would not necessarily be able to say that's because African Americans as individuals lower their frequency of voting or whether that whites who live in those heavily African American municipalities changed their behavior.

Q. Did you in this case look at

changes in turnout in municipalities that
were heavily African American versus
municipalities -
A. Yes, I did, given the -- given

the -- given the available data, I did -- was forced to do an analysis of the aggregates.

The individual level data on partisanship, which Professor Ghitza says was provided to the -- Professor Mayer, was not made available for me to do that analysis. So...

Q. I'm sorry. You looked at that on a municipal-by-municipal basis?

A. Yes.

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016

Page 80

Q. If what one is trying to do is to determine whether certain election laws make it more difficult for voters of a certain race to participate in elections, how is looking at aggregate data on overall turnout useful in answering that question?

A. It is a first step in evaluating whether or not the change in election law had an im -- had an impact on particular racial groups. You want -- might want to know

whether it had an impact overall.

It's in principle the change in election law could have affected white voters, as well as African American voters.

And so that's the first section, just simply took a look at, is there any evidence, this kind of macro level that turnout was suppressed and that turnout was lower in 2014 than in 2000 -- in 2010. It does not, section does not claim to address the question about whether or not there's a racially disparate impact. It's just a question of getting the facts into the record that turnout surged between 2014 and 2010.

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

And indicated that that surge was much

2

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

24

25

1

2

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

2 0

2.1

23

24

25

Page 82

#### Page 81

greater than any previous surge in Wis -- in Wisconsin history. And, therefore, is not consistent with just a continuation of a trend.

- Q. Did you look at whether there was a racially disparate impact between 2010 and 2014?
- A. No. I evaluated the -- the evidence that Professor Mayer provided and I questioned and pointed to several reasons to be skeptical of his results.
- Q. But your results show that the disparity between turnout -- for the disparity in turnout between white voters and black voters and white voters and Hispanic voters between 2010 and 2014 actually increases, correct?
- A. So which -- which results are you referring to?
- Q. Well, let's -- let's talk about Table 1.
- A. Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

1

2

8

9

10

1 1

12

13

1 4

15

1.6

17

18

1 9

20

2.1

23

24

- Q. On page 11. And, again, we're --
- A. All right. To be clear, this is based on individual -- this is based on

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016

Page 83

groups in the 2014 election.

- Q. Okay. And as compared to the 2010 election, correct?
  - A. Well, 2010 is the next column.
- Q. Okay. Oh, sorry. By the first column I actually was starting at -- at real basic principles with white, black, Hispanic, total
  - A. Okay.
- Q. So can you tell me what you meant to convey with that column?
- A. The white, black, Hispanic are just the labels for the various racial and ethnic groups for which we're doing analysis.
- Q. Okay. And how did you define black?
- A. Black was defined exactly as Professor Mayer had defined it in his study, which was based on a statistical procedure conducted by Catalist to estimate from on the basis of an individual's surname and their census track, the probability that they identified as African American.
  - Q. And the same is true of Hispanic?
  - A. That is correct, yes.

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO individual data provided by Professor Mayer.  $\label{eq:Q.Data} \text{Q.} \quad \text{That's right.} \quad \text{So this is not an}$ 

- analysis based on aggregate data, this is --
  - A. That's...
- Q. -- an analysis based on individualized data, correct?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. So Table 1 on page 11 -- and this is page 11 of your report prepared in this case, which has been marked as Exhibit 2. This is where we find out if I can really do math. Don't hold your breath.

I'm going to give this to you.

Okay. Table 1 on page 11 entitled

Turnout By Racial Groups in 2010 and 2014; do
you see that table?

- A. Yes.
  - Q. Let's talk about each of these columns. The first one is obviously race, right, white, black, Hispanic?
    - A. Yes.
- Q. And can you tell me what it is you meant to convey with that column?
  - A. That column presents my estimate of turnout by the various racial and ethnic

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016 Page 84

Q. Okay.

- A. So my definitions are identical to those of Professor Mayer.
- Q. The second column that is titled 2014, what is that column?
- A. That's -- my estimate of the percentage of turnout in that election by each of the aforementioned groups.
- $\ensuremath{\mathtt{Q}}.$  And the third column with 2010 at the top?
- A. That's my estimate of the turnout of each of the groups for the 2010 election.
- 15 A. That's -- D-i-f-f is short for
- difference. That's just the difference in the proportion of turnout for a group for 2014, minus its proportion of turnout for 2010.
  - Q. So, to be clear, although there are percentage symbols after the numbers listed in that column, this column is meant to represent a difference in percentage points?
    - A. That is -- that is correct.
    - Q. It's not the difference in

Page 86

percentage of turnout? 2 Α. That is correct. Okay. So, for example, in the 3 column analyzing turnout for white voters, we 4 get the Diff number by taking 72.8 percent, 5 subtracting 65.5 percent and we get 7.3 6 percentage points? That is correct, yes. 8 9 So 65.5 is not 7.3 percent of 72.8? That is correct, yes. 11 I'm doing okay so far. Yeah, A plus. Thanks. 13 And then you have this last column titled Ratio? 15 16 Α. Ves 17 And I want to make sure I 1.8 understand this correctly, I'm not trying to 19 put words in your mouth. 2.0 Δ Sure Q. I saw the word "ratio" and I 21

## Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

tells us that 71.3 percent of voters turned

April 14, 2016

Page 87

that the turnout of whites in 2014 was about

111 percent of what it was in 2010; is that

So what this basically means is

automatically had a panic attack.

2.2

23

24

25

8

10

1 1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

says.

right?

Okav.

A. That's correct, yeah. And, again, that's about an 11 percent increase in turnout overall between 2010 and 2014? Yeah, that's what the table shows. Okay. And you don't try to identify the reasons for that increase in turnout? A. No. Q. Okay. Let's take a closer look at the 2010 column in Table 1 of your report. So you say that in 2010 65.5 percent of white registered voters turned out to vote, correct? I estimate that that is correct. Okay. And I understand these are estimates. I'm not going to hold you to --

> Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

black registered voters turned out to vote,

you know, I just want to talk what the table

And the same year, 56.2 percent of

1	right?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. Okay. So, again, and I'm not
4	harping on this, but the difference in the
5	turnout for white voters between 2010 and
6	2014 was about 11 percent?
7	A. 11 percent higher, yes.
8	Q. Okay. Not 7.3 percent?
9	A. No, that's just the percentage
10	point difference.
11	Q. Okay. And I think your table also
12	tells us, but correct me if I'm wrong, the
13	total numbers at the bottom. Does that tell
14	us that in 2010 64.3 percent of registered
15	voters turned out to vote?
16	A. Yes. But based on my estimate,
17	which is based on a weighted sample that I
18	needed to do to correct for the attrition in
19	the file, but given that estimate that's
2 0	the that's what comes out. So it may not
21	match because of the problems associated with
22	the attrition, the roll off, and you might
23	need to re-weight it, may not match official
24	numbers.
25	Q. Okay. And in in 2014, the table
	Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

```
Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.
                                               April 14, 2016
                                             Page 88
              Yes.
1
 2
              So in 2010, there was a disparity
    in turnout between white and black registered
    voters of 9.3 percentage points?
         A. That is correct.
              And your table tells us that in
    2010 only 4 point -- 43.3 percent of Hispanic
 8
     registered voters turned out?
 9
              Yes.
10
              And if we can compare that to the
11
    percentage of white voters that turned out in
    2010, we see there was a disparity in turnout
12
    between white and Hispanic voters of 22.2
13
    percentage points?
14
            That is correct, ves.
15
        Α.
         Q. You don't need the calculator? I
16
    needed the calculator. That's why you're a
17
    professor and I am not.
18
              Okay. Let's keep talking about
19
20
2.1
              What I want to talk about now is
    what it tells us about the disparity in
    turnout of registered voters for each of
23
    these racial groups. What happens to the
    disparity between white and black turnout in
                  Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company
```

April 14, 2016

Page 90

20142 In terms of the percentage point gap, it increased slightly. Okay. So if we look at the first column in your Table 1, we have white turnout in 2014 at 72.8 percent, correct? That's correct. We have black turnout in 2014 at 62.2 percent? I'm sorry? Oh, yeah. Okay, yes, black turn -yes. So in 2014, we now have a disparity between white and black turnout of 10.6 percentage points? Α. That is correct. And so the disparity has gone up since 2010, according to your table? Measured in the absolute percentage point difference, yes.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

between white and Hispanic voters in 2014.

how does that compare to the 22.2 point

disparity we observed in 2010?

What about the disparity in turnout

I believe it is now 23.6, so it's

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016 Page 91 No. 1 2 And then let's look at Table 2. which is on page 13 of your report. Now, that table is titled Turnout of Voting Age Citizens, right? That's correct, yes. So the difference between Table 1 8 and Table 2, other than the fact that the 9 numbers are a little different, but is in 10 Table 1 we're looking at the turnout by 1 1 racial groups, so does that include entire populations? 12 What does that mean? 13 What's the difference between 14 racial groups, turnout of racial groups 15 versus the turnout of voting age citizens? 16 So the Table 1 is based on the 17 people who are actually in the registration 18 file. 1 9 20 Ο. Oh, that's right. I'm sorry. Yes, 2.1 I had a moment. 22 Okay. So just so we're clear, Table 1, Turnout By Racial Groups, this 23 24 actually means, although it's not in the title, but it is in your report, that this is

> Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

slightly higher. 1 2 Ο. So it's gone up, too? Yes 3 What -- I think you -- you touched 4 on this, but I just want to make sure. 5 data did you use to calculate the figures you 6 have in Table 1? The data of the State voter file 8 that Professor Mayer provided. 9 10 Okay. And did you do anything to 11 it before you used it? 12 As described in the report, I needed to correct for the attrition, the fact 13 that voters tend to remain on the voter files longer than non-voters. And any attempts to 15 16 calculate turnout by groups or overall 17 without correcting for it would be severely 1.8 biased. So I used the procedure as described 19 in the report to weight the individual observations for each group based -- for --2.0 for each person and in each county based on 21 the roll-off patterns in that particular 2.2 23 county. Ο. Did you do anything else, anything 24 not described in your report? 25

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

Page 92 about registered voters? 1 2 3 Okav. While Table 2 is Turnout of Voting Age Citizens. So that would include voting age citizens who are not registered voters? 7 That is correct. 8 But it would also include 9 registered voters? 10 Α. 11 So it's a -- just a larger group? 12 Α. It's just a larger group. Okay. 13 Ω Α. And that's why the turnout numbers 1 4 are lower. 15 Ο. Because registered voters tend to 16 vote at higher rates than non-registered 17 18 Yes. Non-registered voters don't 19 2 0 vote, because they're not supposed to. 2.1 Until they register, until they become registered voters.

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company

Why did you do this analysis with

(866) 448-DEPO

regard to voting age citizens, as well as

just in regard to registered voters?

23

2 4

25

three groups.

Ο.

1

2

3

Page 94

So it was in recognition that some of the changes in Wisconsin law took place might have affected rates of registration So you wouldn't want -- you'd want to -- some sense of control for that effect.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

8 9

10

1 1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

24

So we'd like to know that even though turnout among registrants went up, it's not because the number of registrants went down. So by benchmarking it to the entire eligible population, we could eliminate that possibility.

- What -- did you use the same data to calculate the figures you have in Table 2 as you did to calculate the figures in Table 1?
- Α. The data on who voted is exactly the same. The denominator, though, is the citizen vote -- the citizen voting age population, which I had to obtain from the census for each of the -- for each of the municipal -- for each of the -- or, actually, for this -- let me be careful here.
- Yeah, I -- I calculated the 23 statewide citizen voting age populations for 24 each of those elections, for each of the 25

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

the data is described in your report? 4 That's correct, yes. As well as all of the statistical programs that I would 5 have used for these calculations were made available. Q. What do you mean by "were made 8 available"? 9 10 As part of my sub -- submission, I 11 submitted all my computer files. 12 Gotcha. Do you identify in your report 13 which -- I'm sorry, what -- it's not 14 software, it's -- what's it called? 15 16 this shows how little I understand computers. 17 A. Well, software. I mean, it's a 1.8 statistical program, STATA, which is exactly 19 the same one that Professor Mayer used. THE COURT REPORTER. What's the 2.0 name of it? 21 THE WITNESS: STATA, S-T-A-T-A. 2.2 23 all of the letters are capitalized, for trademark reasons. 24 BY MS. FROST: 25

Okay. And everything you did to

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016

Page 95

- And did you -- do you identify when you use STATA in your report?
  - In this report?
- I'm not sure that I -- I'm not sure that I do.
- Did you use STATA in all the same circumstances that Dr. Mayer used STATA?
- I -- I essentially only use STATA. There may be other instances where he did not for some reasons, but they were not things that I was responding to. So everything was done in STATA

In fact, in many cases, my work appended upon the STATA files that he submitted to me, just to make sure that I was doing everything exactly as he had done, up until the point at which I proposed --

- Okay. But you didn't --Ο.
- -- deviations.
- You didn't use any statistical program other than the STATA for your expert work in this case?
  - Α.
  - Let's look at Table 2, page 13 of

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016

Page 96 your expert report, which has been marked as 1 2 Exhibit 2 for the purposes of this deposition. Now, according to this table, in 2010, 54.5 of the white voting age citizens in Wisconsin turned out to vote, correct? That's correct.

- 7 Okay. 46.2 of black voting age 8 citizens turned out to vote that same year?
  - That's correct, yes.

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

- So in 2010 there was a disparity between black and white turnout of voting age citizens of 8.3 percentage points?
  - That's correct
- Now, in 2014, 59.1 of white voting 14 age citizens turned out to vote, correct? 15
  - Α. That's correct.
  - While 50.2 of black voting age citizens did, correct?
  - Correct.
  - Meaning that in 2014, there was a disparity between black and white turnout of 8.9 percentage points?
  - That's correct, yes.
    - So, again, the disparity went up?
    - The percentage point difference

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Page 98

went up, yeah. 2 Ο. Right. What about Hispanics as opposed to 3 white voters, let's do the same calculation. 4 5 It's not even really a calculation. It's an observation, I quess. According to your Table 2, turnout of Hispanic voting age citizens in 2010 was 8 9 21.4 percent? 11 And that's citizens, right? Yeah, the denominator -- the denominator is the number of Hispanic citizens of voting age in Wisconsin. Okay. Now, compared to white 15 turnout of voting aged citizens in 2010, 16 1 7 that's a difference of 33.1 percentage 1.8 points, correct? 19 Α. That's correct. And if we look at 2014, that 2.0 disparity increases, doesn't it? 21 It's 26.1 in 2014, that is a larger 2.2 23 gap. 36.1? 24 Ο.

## Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

36.1. ves.

25

1

8

10

1 1

12

13

1 4

15

16

17

18

1 9

20

2.1

23

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016

# Page 99

- Q. You're not making some sort of broader statement about how, let me finish, large gains from states with already high turnout rates are rare?
- A. No, I would just -- it was just a way of summarizing the point I just made about the data.
- Q. And, specifically, about the data about states turnout rates between 2010 and 2014, correct?
  - A. Specifically, yes, yeah.
- Q. Now, Wisconsin actually saw a higher increase in turnout in the 2012 recall election, didn't it?
  - A. Higher than what?
  - Q. Than in 2014.
- A. It had a higher turnout in 2012 than 2014? That's possible. Again, I was focused on the comparison 2010, 2014.
- Q. Okay. But you didn't mention that election in your report, the recall election?
- A. No, I did not. No. I may have mentioned one -- in one very narrow place, which was to criticize the use of it as a predictor of behavior in 2014, given that

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

2 correct you on some math. I'll put the glasses back on My 3 4 vision... Now, you say in your report that 5 Wisconsin started with a very high turnout 6 level in 2010; is that correct? It's relatively high compared to 8 other states. 9 10 Okay. And that large gains from 11 states with already high turnout rates are rare; is that something you say in your report? 13 Yes, I -- I just noted that of 14 this -- of the states that were in the top 15 ten in 2014, most of them actually saw a 16 17 turnout fall. 1.8 So that's what that statement is 1 9 based on, just how those states in the top ten performed --2.0 Α. Yes, ves. 21 -- between 2010 and 2014 --2.2 23 Α. Yes. -- correct? 24 Ο. 2.5 Δ Yes.

You just made my day, having me

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016

Page 100

some of the legal changes had taken place
prior to the recall election, as I understand
it. And, therefore, it wasn't as clean a
comparison as comparing the 2010 election in
2014, for which none of the changes had taken
place -Q. Okay. But we have a --

A. -- in 2010

1

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

23

24

- Q. But we have -- I will represent to you, we have a higher overall turnout in Wisconsin in 2012 for the recall election. Okay? Okay?
- A. Yeah, that does not surprise me, no.
- Q. Several of the laws challenged in this lawsuit were not in effect at the time of the recall, correct?
  - A. That's my understanding, yes.
- Q. So then two years later, we have a lower recount in a regular -- a lower overall voter turnout in a regularly scheduled election, correct?
- A. That is correct.
- Q. Do you think that is relevant to your analysis?

2

3

4

5

6

7

1.8

1

2

7

8

9

10

11

12

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

23

24

that I was doing

Page 102

Again, I think that the best kind of industry standard for doing this type of analysis is to compare apples and apples. And I would say that the 2012 recall election was an extremely unusual, high profile election. And, therefore, would be hard to know how to use it in an analysis like this.

Well, it was extremely unusual, but certainly doesn't it tell us something about what's happening with the voters in Wisconsin?

Well, what we would want to know is like suppose we had a recall election without the laws in place and we can compare the two recall elections. That's the best comparison; we don't have that. So I, you know, followed the standard practice of trying to find two elections that are roughly similar, one pre and one post and compare them

Ο. That turnout bump in between 2010 and 2014, you think that's entirely irrelevant to your conclusion that there's little to no evidence that the laws impacted turnout?

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016

Page 103

correct?

1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

1 2

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

2 5

Α. On Table 1?

Yeah.

It's not eligible voters. It's

Ο. Sorry, registered voters, I apologize.

So this table shows that the overall turnout of registered voters increased between 2010 and 2014 by 7 percentage points, right?

Yes, that's what the table shows. Α.

That's this Diff column?

Yes.

Now, I think you said that some of your academic work has been about turnout in Presidential elections: is that correct?

And -- and mid-term elections.

Okay. Do you happen to know how much voter turnout of registered voters increased in the Presidential election between 2000 and 2004?

Increased for the Presidential election? I wouldn't know the registered, I

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

different an election to compare it to 8 2000 -- to 2014. Had there been a 9 10 Presidential -- had there been a Presidential 11 election at the same time, turnout would have been higher. Q. 13 Even though --You wouldn't want to compare that, 14 15 16 Ο. Even though we have Scott Walker 17 again on the ballot, correct?

T -- T don't think -- T don't think

No, it's just too -- it's just too

it's helpful for doing the type of comparison

O. Okay. But do you think it's

challenged laws impacted overall turnout?

relevant to that question as to whether the

19 Now, let's look at Table 1 in your report. And let's look at -- this is on page 2.0 11 of your report, which has been marked as 21

Yes

Exhibit 2 in this deposition. The total 2.2 23 numbers on the bottom, this chart shows the overall turnout of eligible voters increased 24 between 2010 and 2014 by 7 percentage points, 25

> Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

> > Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

Page 104

April 14, 2016

wouldn't be able to tell you the registered number. All my work was based on citizen voting, essentially based on citizen voting age population.

Okay. So, and if we look at your Table 2, that's the number we see, the Total column in the Diff column, that's 4.1 percentage points. So in Wisconsin what we observe is that the turnout of voting age citizens increased between 2010, 2014 by 4.1 percentage points; is that correct?

That is correct, yeah.

So do vou remember who ran for 13 President in the general election in 2000 and 14 20042 15

> Α. Yes.

Who, who ran in 2004?

That was an election between George Bush and Al Gore. Oh, I'm sorry, you're asking about -- you asked 2004?

2004, yeah.

Got me off track.

2004.

2004, it was John Kerry versus George Bush.

2

3

4

7

2.2

23

24

25

1

2

8

9

10

11

12

2.1

23

24

candidate?

Α.

Page 106

Page 10

- Q. And when we're talking about George Bush, we're talking George W. Bush?
  - A. That is correct, yes.
- $\ensuremath{\mathtt{Q}}.$  Are you familiar with studies that have shown that -- actually, back up just a second

Would it surprise you to learn that overall turnout increased by 7 percentage points between 2000 and 2004 in the Presidential election?

- A. That would not surprise me, no.
- Q. Why not?

2

3

4

5

8

9

11

15

16

1 7

1.8

19

2.0

21

22

24

25

7

8

9

10

1 1

12

13

1 4

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

- A. It seems plausible with my
- recollection of these data.
- $\ensuremath{\mathtt{Q}}.$  Is that a standard increase in turnout between Presidential election years?
- A. If that's the number, I would say that's probably larger than the standard increase.
- Q. And are you familiar with studies that have shown that the main reason that turnout increased by that amount, which I will represent to you is a larger than standard number of increase in turnout between Presidential elections, but are you

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

referring to. 8 Would you be surprised -- or do you 9 10 have any reason to doubt that that's the 11 Yeah, I would have reasons to 12 doubt. There are other big increases in 13 turnout that don't involve polarizing candidates. So you'd have to do a more 15 16 rigorous comparison than just simply asking 17 voters whether they voted because they found 1.8 George Bush polarizing. 19 But you don't know whether or not that was -- how those studies were conducted? 2.0 I -- I don't know how, but I don't 21

aware of studies that have shown the reason

or the main reason that turnout increased by

that amount, 7 percentage points from 2000 to

2004, was the fact that George W. Bush was by

I'm not aware of the studies you're

2004 an extremely polarizing political

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Because polarizing is -- it's hard

know any other way at which you would conduct

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016

 $$\operatorname{\mathtt{Page}}\xspace$  107 to know what that means, other than simply

asking somebody whether they find an

individual polarizing or not.

- Q. You yourself have not studied the reasons for the increase in turnout between 2000 and 2004, the Presidential election?
  - A. No, I have not.
- Q. Do you disagree that when you have a particularly polarizing candidate that itself can impact turnout?
- A. Sure, it's one of the many factors that might increase turnout.
- Q. And, in fact, that's an example of one factor that might increase turnout that is probably a lot of factors combined, right?
- A. Yes, yes. One of many factors, ves.
- Q. And what I mean by that is, for example, when you have a highly polarizing candidate, you might see more turnout because voters are motivated to come out and vote for or against that person?
  - A. Yes, that's possible.
- $\label{eq:Q.You might have more enthusiastic} \\$  get out the vote efforts?

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016

Page 108

A. Sure.

such a study.

Ο.

Q. You might have more money spent in the election?

A. It's possible, yes.

And you --

- Q. You might have more ads?
- A. Yes
- Q. You might have more effective ads?
  - A. Perhaps.
  - $\ensuremath{\mathtt{Q}}.$  You might have -- okay. That's what I got there.

In 2014 Governor Walker was a very polarizing candidate, wasn't he?

- A. Yes, I believe that there were strong opinions on both sides.
- Q. A lot had happened since he was first elected in 2010, right?
- MR. JOHNSON-KARP: Object to

18 form.

BY MS. FROST:

Q. In fact, there were massive protests involving tens of thousands of people at the State Capitol in 2011 against a bill introduced by Walker, correct?

April 14, 2016

Page 110

```
A. That is correct, yes.

Q. And the voters of Wisconsin
```

attempted to get him recalled in 2012, correct?

A. That is correct, yes.

- Q. And before Walker was re-elected in 2014, didn't polls show him to have only a very narrow lead, sometimes within the margin of error?
- $\hbox{A.} \quad \hbox{I recall reading -- I recall}$  reading that.
  - Q. Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

2

8

9

10

1 1

12

13

1 4

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

- A. But the final outcome is also something that's close in the marginal of error.
  - Q. You --
- A. Marginal error polls are usually about four percent. His -- his final lead wasn't very much larger than the margin of error. So we don't know that there's any -- so the statement you make could be true, yet the outcome be totally consistent with what those polls were finding at the time without any other change.
  - He won reelection by margin of

    Capital Reporting A Veritext Company
    (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

(866) 448-DEPO

April 14, 2016

Page 111

THE WITNESS: I conducted -so, I mean, it wasn't an ideal analysis, but
I conducted analyses of the variation between
the two elections in 2010 and 2014, both in
terms of the Walker share and in terms of the
turnout. So one, roughly speaking, would
expect that there was a big polarizing
effect, that you would see huge differences
between 2010 and 2014 in the most Walker
municipalities and huge differences between
the Walker vote in the least Walker
municipalities. I did not find that.

- Q. But as you said earlier, we don't know whether more people would have voted in this election but for these laws?
- A. That's true. And, I mean, there's no way to document that counterfactual, one way or another --
- ${\tt Q.} \qquad {\tt Your \ analysis \ gives \ us \ no \ insight}$  into that?
- A. I believe some insight. I mean, the -- the increase was very large. It's not -- was not the case that Wisconsin had been trending toward more turnout. And so extrapolating -- there's no trend to

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

almost 6 percentage points, right? 1 Okay. Yeah, that -- that's right, 2 I was thinking 5, but, yeah, 5.8. 3 O. And you don't think the fact that 4 an election that was so contentious that many 5 people thought would be much closer ended up 6 being won by almost 6 percentage points could potentially be due to the fact that 8 Wisconsin's new laws did, in fact, suppress 9 10 turnout among traditional Democratic 11 constituencies? MR. JOHNSON-KARP: Object to 12 13 THE WITNESS: Lots of things 14 are possible. I just don't see any evidence 15 16 that that was the reason. 17 BY MS. FROST: 1.8 Did vou control for that 19 possibility in any of the analyses that you conducted for this case? 2.0 I conducted analysis where I looked 21 at variations in turnout across 2.2 municipalities and I looked for differences 23 in the --24 (Off-the-record discussion.) 25

> Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

> > Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016

Page 112

1 extrapolate. So it's hard -- you know, it's

2 hard to know. But, you know...

3 Q. So are you telling me there's

4 nothing you could have done to control for

5 the competitiveness of that election?

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

23

A. We -- to control for something, you need some variation. You need some election -- at the same time, it's less competitive and more competitive than you can control.

Looking at this election over election, essentially the same strategy that Professor Mayer used. There's -- there's no way to -- to -- to look at the extent to which polarization or competitiveness would've affected these results.

Q. Did you look at -- I mean, if you look at, like, public FEC reports or similar things in Wisconsin, you can see how much money was spent on the races in the gubernatorial from 2010 to 2014. Did you look to see if there was any difference in that?

A. No, I did not look at that.
That wouldn't have answered the

Page 114

Page 11

question, because there's a far amount, large amount of uncertainty as to whether or not campaign spending would increase or depress turnout. There's contention about demobilizing effects of campaign expenditure versus evidence for the mobilizing effects of campaign expenditures. So just looking at aggregate expenditure totals wouldn't have been very helpful in controlling for that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

22

24

2.5

1

2

3

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

Q. But do you not think it's -- when you're presenting your findings, you don't think it's important to say, Look, there are all these other things going on in Wisconsin that potentially could have affected the turnout? I mean, you're just looking at these aggregate numbers and you're saying, I don't see any evidence of this, but you're ignoring everything that was happening in Wisconsin. And you don't mention in your report at all, and I'm wondering why you don't mention any of this in your report?

MR. JOHNSON-KARP: Object to form.

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016 Nolan Mc

1

2

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

Page 115

you know, we don't find the effects, the differences that the Plaintiffs' experts had provided and that's what my focus was on, not on doing a full analysis of everything that could have possibly affected the 2014 gubernatorial election.

Q. Okay. What else might you have done if you had more time?

A. Well, I think the central -- I mean, a lot of central questions revolve around the partisan, the partisan effect, potential partisan effects.

The individual level data, linking estimates of partisanship to individual voters would have been very useful. With proper time, I might have been able to acquire it. I know that the experts -- the experts -- I mean, the Plaintiffs' experts had that data and chose not to use it, or provide it or even use it to rebut the aggregate analysis that I did do, but I think that would be the highest priority, would be to look at individual level voting choice between the two elections on the basis of partisanship. That, I wasn't able to do,

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

2 that can affect -- that can affect turnout. And all I'm doing is responding to the 3 4 evidence that was provided, that there was an effect in arguing that that is not good 5 evidence that there was. I was not trying to 6 7 arque that there was an effect, but I've been in a situation where I was trying to put 8 9 forward, you know, my own report, trying to 10 document as closely as possible that there 11 could not have possibly been an effect and 12 had more than the three weeks I had, then there might have been some other things that 13 I could have -- other parts of context that I could have added. But, you know, if you look 15 16 at -- look at the data I do show, whether or 17 not the counterfactual is true or not, we 1.8 find that, you know, the -- proportionately, 19 blacks were no less likely to vote in 2014 over 2010 than were whites. Yes, the 2.0 absolute magnitude changes, but that's 21 2.2 because the baselines are different. 23 thing is roughly true for Hispanics. there wasn't really a mystery that I was 24 trying to explain. It was just simply that, 25

several occasions is there are lots of things

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016

Page 116

because the data wasn't -- wasn't available.

O. But you had that data for race.

right, and you didn't do it --

A. I didn't have it for race.

Q. You didn't do the individualized analysis --

A. No, this is --

Q. -- for the effect of race?

 $\hbox{A.} \quad \hbox{These are individual analyses.}$   $\hbox{These are the -- I mean, these are the}$ 

turnout rates of individuals based on their estimate of race. Yes, I have to average up, all statistical analysis has to -- you know, has to do. There is something like -- I think -- what is it? Five -- five million registered voters? I can't look at every individual piece of data, so you have to average and present the data in some way. And these tables present the averages, you know, for these -- for these groups.

Q. These --

A. And I -- and I find that -- you know, that there was about a nine percent increase of black voting age citizen, nine percent chance, increasing the chance that

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

18

19

20

2.1

23

24

25

Page 118

Page 11

they would vote.

1

2

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

22

24

25

1

8

9

10

1 1

12

13

1 4

15

16

17

18

1 9

20

2.1

23

24

- Q. But they don't tell you whether a black citizen that voted in 2010 was more or less likely to vote in 2014, they don't tell you that about the individual voter, do they?
- A. This -- this table -- this table does not -- this table does not report that, no.
  - Q. And you did not do that analysis, aid you?
- A. No, I don't believe I -- I don't believe I did that analysis, no.
- Q. Do you know if the population of black voting age citizens changed in Wisconsin from 2010 to 2014?
- A. I know the change in proportions, their change in proportion of the citizen voting age population is reported on page 13. They were 5.3 percent of the citizen voting age population in 2010 and they were 5.79 percent of the voting age population in 2014.
- Q. Okay. So that increased, correct?
  - A. That increased, yeah, by a smidge.
  - Q. But you don't know anything about

## Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016

Page 119

the same black population, the increase and the turnout rate would have been higher.

- Q. Did you look at how low-propensity voters behaved in Wisconsin in the 2014 gubernatorial election, in particular?
- A. No, I did not isolate voters as to whether they're high or low propensity to vote.
- Q. And you would agree that, of course, the way that a particular voter may behave from one election to another can change?
- A. Yes, of course. So I'm looking at the averages, can change in both directions, what happened on average.
- Q. An average of all voters, not low-propensity versus high-propensity voters, correct?
  - A. That's correct, yes.
- Q. And so we don't know, based on your report, whether low-propensity voters attempted to vote or turned out to vote in greater numbers than usual in 2014 due to the highly polarizing nature of Walker's candidacy, do we?

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

those new black citizens, correct?

No, I don't know that.

low-propensity voters.

No. I don't know whether they're

And you don't know whether they're

No, I don't know that. Although,

So the best guess on the basis of

neonle who did not live in Wisconsin before

I don't know whether they're, you know,

people who were 16 in 2010 and 20 in 2014.

low-propensity or high-propensity voters?

if the new ones were low-propensity vote --

were low-propensity voters, it would

strengthen the case that I made. And

suggests that younger voters are

oftentimes the evidence in the literature

low-propensity voters and people who've

the research would be that the additions to

the voting population were -- were low --

were low-propensity voters and so the fact

that you're adding low-propensity voters and,

vet, the turnout rates are increasing, would

the same under those hypotheses, if it were

strengthen the case. In fact, if it had been

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

recently moved to a new community are

April 14, 2016

Page 120

MR. JOHNSON-KARP: Object to

form.

THE WITNESS: No, I don't know.

BY MS. FROST:

- Q. And, of course, these tables don't tell us anything about people who tried to vote but couldn't, correct?
  - A. That is correct, yes.
- Q. And, in any event, when you say Wisconsin had a very high turnout level in 2010, you mean based on all voters, regardless of race. correct?
- 13 A. Yes.
- Q. And you say that in your report that in 2010 Wisconsin had the sixth largest VAP and fourth largest VEP turnout in the U.S.?
  - A. Yeah, if you could direct me, I can
  - Q. I think it's near the beginning.

    Let me find it. I feel like it's on page 6.

    Yeah, page 6, second full paragraph near the bottom.
    - A. Yes, that's what I wrote.
    - Q. And, again, when we're talking

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

25

1

2

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

23

24

25

Page 122

about VAP and VEP, that's including all voters, no matter what their race, correct?

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

1 2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1 9

20 2.1

23

25

- That's correct And also it's also included in whether or not they're citizens or not. So it's different than the citizen VAP and -- well, VAP would control for whether they're citizens, but the VAP would include -- would include non-citizens in the denominator.
- Did you look to see how African American turnout in Wisconsin compared to
- No, I did not -- I did not make that comparison. Many states don't -- like Wisconsin, do not -- do not require registrants to indicate their race. And so there's no generally accepted data set that would compare the racial turnout rates. Some of them, to the extent to which they exist, they're based on surveys, such as the current population survey. But as I indicated in my report, I found there's some reliability issues in the measurement of African American turnout rate at the State level from those data. And that Professor Burden in using

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016

Page 123

Turn -- turnout -- turnout --Hispanic registration is very low in Wisconsin and in lots of places. Therefore, you know, the percentage of Hispanic participation as a function of the voting age citizenry is -- is -- is really closer to 25 percent, tops.

- And that disparity gets worse, we've established, between 2010 and 2014?
- Well, the difference -- again, the difference between white turnout and Hispanic turnout in percentage point terms, does increase. Hispanics, exclusively, their propensity to vote only rose seven -seven percent. They're only seven percent more likely to vote as compared to eight for whites and nine for blacks. So -- so Hispanics are low -- low turn -- are low -are low turn -- are low turnout and have not expanded their turnout as quickly as the other groups.
- And you're not offering any opinion as to the impact of these laws in Wisconsin on Hispanic voters?
  - No, I'm not offering any opinion.

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company

April 14, 2016

Page 124

I -- I will, you know, stipulate that, you know, they turn out slow and they witnessed a less substantial increase than the other groups.

So then doesn't that mean they would have much more room to increase; isn't that correct, their turnout has much more room to grow?

That's possible, but it also may reflect there's features of that community that it's just not conducive to turnout, even in the best of circumstances. And we don't know the extent to which the treatment as we've been calling it, you know, would have affected them more or less, given that, you know -- because of language, other things, mobility, being new communities, all things which are typical in Hispanic population in the U.S. That that's the cause of low turnout and then impressive increase.

As a general matter, when you make changes to a state's registration laws, is this more or less likely to impact voters with higher mobility? MR. JOHNSON-KARP: Object to

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

And the same is true of Hispanic turnout in Wisconsin compared to other states, you didn't look at that? I did not look at that. It would run into the same problems. In fact, the

problems would probably be even worse. And by your own numbers in your

Tables 1 and 2, it looks like 2010 and 2014. Hispanic turnout never gets over 50 percent: is that right?

those data erroneously found a decline of

something that's not evident when you look at

such a comparison would be to use the current

population studies from the various states.

racial groups. There's lots of noise, lots

of error. And so it just would not have been

The samples are quite small for smaller

a useful exercise to try to do those

So the only way I could have done

black turnout rate from 2010 to 2014,

the actual individual level data.

23 A. Hispanic turnout is a percentage of registrants, hasn't reached 50 percent. 24

What about as a turnout --

24

25

1

2

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

23

24

25

attrition.

Page 126

Page 12

form.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

2

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

THE WITNESS: Well, voters who change locations have to -- have to register So it's a -- kind of a mechanical matter. yes, it has to. Now, the guestion is, you know, how big are those burdens. And is it the registration burden itself that's preventing new residents from voting or is it just a simple, you know, lack of a fit into the local community, a lack of engagement in the local community that's typical of people who've just -- who've just moved. So there are lots of reasons why new residents might register at low rate, reregister at low rates, some of which may have to do with the process of the registration, some of which may have to do with lots of other -- lots of factors. People who move tend to be younger. Younger voters tend to vote less, therefore register less. So there's a lot of things that -- that could impact that. So I wouldn't rule out in principle that the effects could be bigger for groups that move around a lot. But there are lots of things

> Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

that are kind of working against the

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016

Page 127

general feature, but it's especially true in the Wisconsin case, that people who vote tend to remain on the voter rolls. People who don't vote tend to roll off. So from one election to the next, people who stay on the rolls are disproportionately voters; people who didn't vote, disproportionately leave. So that means when you try to do a -- that means that when you try to do turnout calculation in one of the earlier elections. you have a biased sample of people that's -tends to overrepresent or oversample voters. Okav. So, vou know, if you look at the 2015 -- if you look at the 2015 voter file and look at the people who voted in 2006 -look, it's going to dispro -- and look at the -- how people voted in 2006, they're disproportionately going to be voters, because of this dis -- dis -- asymmetry in the rates -- in the rates of -- in the rates of roll off. Now, how does this affect the

> Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

racial differences in turnout? Well, there's

a ceiling effect, no group can vote more than

100 percent. So if you systematically

participation of those groups in elections. 1 2 BY MS. FROST: Let's look at Table 3 in your 3 Ο 4 report. It's on page 17 of the document that's been marked as McCarty deposition 5 Exhibit 2. Can you just walk me through 6 this? I have to admit this table confounds 7 8 9 Α. Okay. 10 I cannot figure it out. 11 Okav. I'm happy to do that. 12 The context, of course, is that Professor Mayer's voter file data is a 13 snapshot from 2015. Yet, he uses that to estimate turnout rates, as well as models of 15 16 turnout for elections prior to 2014, 2008, 17 '10, '12, whatever. The problem, of course, 1.8 with doing that is that the 2015 voter file 19 is going to be an inaccurate record of both 2.0 who was eligible to vote in 2006, in 2010, as well as an inaccurate record of who 21 2.2 actually -- who actually did vote, because of

> Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

So there's a feature, I think is a

the problem of roll off or what I call

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016

 $$\operatorname{\textit{Page}}\xspace$  128 throwing non-voters off the voting rolls and

keeping the voters, then almost everybody is a voter, whether they're white or black, and it's going to kind of compress in the estimate of the racial -- of the racial difference. Okay?

So what I did in 2000 -- in -- I'm sorry, in Table 3, is I tried to show that effect. Okay. So what I do is I take, for each of the mid-term elections in the voter file, again, so I can -- so that I can compare, you know, apples to apples, I take the various samples. I take people who are in the voter file in 2006, there's one sample. The second sample is the people, all the people who were in the voter file for 2008, all the people who are in 2010, '12, '14, et cetera. So they're kind of -- only really true difference between the races is going to be for the 2004 -- is going to be for the 2014 election based on the people who are actually in the sample in 2014 you find a racial difference of 10.5.

> Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

when you go back to kind of previous

The point I wanted to make is that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

2.5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

23

24

25

attrition rate.

Page 130

elections, the racial gap is going to necessarily be smaller, because you're over -- voters are overrepresented in those files. So if you take a look at the 2014 election and you look at the people who are in the voter file in 2006, the racial gap was only 2.8 percent, compared to the observed racial gap of 10.5.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2 23

24

25

1

2

7

8

9

10

1 1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

25

So all the elections that Professor Mayer analyzed prior to 2014 are going to have a downward bias in the estimate of the racial gap. So that's what this table is reflecting.

If you analyze the -- if you analyze the -- so if you analyze -- if you're analyzing the -- for example -- walk through one of these cases. So if you take the sample of people who are in the file in 2008, the racial gap would be 5.8 in 2006, it would be .05 in 2010 and 2.8 in 2014. Okay. So they're smaller compared to what you would find if you use the 2008 sample, which is less roll off, less attrition. So you'd have a racial gap of 10.8 in 2010 and a racial gap of only 8.3 in 2014. So if you looked at

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

that sample, actually the racial gap, the

racial gap goes down. If you look at it

in 2014. These are all impacted by this

about the table is that the bulk of his

analysis is comparing an increase in the

racial gap. Implicitly in his regression

analysis it compares to the racial gap in 2010, where he finds that blacks --

controlling for lots and lots of stuff,

blacks were no less likely to vote than

The 2010 election, if you use the 2008

extent to which the conclusion that the

racial gap in his model increases between

case for -- for 2010.

whites, with 2014 where he finds an effective

race. Well, as you can see from the table,

2010 is the sole election for which based on

the 2006 sample there's almost no racial gap.

sample, you'd actually have a larger racial

gap than 2014 would have had, as would be the

So the table really gets at the

based on the 2010 sample, again, you get a

racial gap of 9.3 in 2010 and only one of 8.1

The other point I wanted to make

April 14, 2016

Page 131

April 14, 2016

2010 and 2014 is really driven in quite a lot, large degree by his choice of using the snapshot 2014 and then using the full sample of people who are in the file as of 2006.

- Okav. I have a couple follow-up questions.
  - Okay, good.
- So if I'm following you, which is a big if, but if I'm following you, still this number 10.5 for 2014 for the sample, 2014 for the election should be right, do you dispute that number?
- Yes but with the -- with the one caveat, that that's the gap only among the people who are just in -- who are just in the sample -- no, no. Yes, that -- that would be right, ves. Those would be the right gaps. sorry.
  - Ο. Okay.
- Α. Those would be the right gaps. Yeah, the gaps actually observed for those elections.
- Okay. Do you have any reason to believe that African Americans roll off the rolls at higher rates than other voters?

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Page 132

No, I don't, did not have any data 1 2 on roll-off rate by race. I -- I did -- in 3 the -- in the weighting that I did in other parts, I did -- I use county level data on roll off to control, but I don't know if I looked to see whether there could be 7 correlation with how African American the 8 municipality was. So, so I don't know the 9 answer to that.

Ο. Do you think that's an important question to ask?

It would certainly add precision to the -- it would add precision to these questions to -- to know the -- to know the answer. If -- as I describe in the report. it could have -- it could affect -- it could affect the results, not obviously in one direction or another. Again, it depends mostly on the relative rates of roll off of voters and non-voters much more than the kind of rate -- the roll-off rates of African Americans versus whites. So if for some reason that African American non-voters are rolling off at much faster rates than African American voters are, that would, I think that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

1

2

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

23

24

25

Page 134

Page 13

would be the most substantial impact on these results.

 $\label{eq:Q.And how would that impact these} % \begin{center} \b$ 

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

15

1.6

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

2

8

9

10

11

1 2

13

14

15

1.6

17

18

19

20

23

24

A. See if I have a section -- I have a section on that, so let me try not to reinvent the wheel.

So on page 10, again, this -- this applies to the calculations of weights, but also, therefore, it would be relating to the -- these roll-off effects. So I say the largest threat to correct calculations would be if it were the case that within each municipality one group of non-voters had a disproportionate roll-off rate.

If that were the case, my procedure would overestimate the turnout of that group, because if I -- if they're rolling off disproportionately, then I'm sort of keeping too many of them -- too many of them on and, therefore, I would overestimate the turnout of that group and underestimate the turnout of other groups. For example, if within each district, black non-voters rolled off at higher rates, my estimate of the number of

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016

Page 135

calculation of turnout. The main effect -the main place where there'd be an effect of
turnout is if one groups of non-voters would
roll off in a much -- in a much greater rate
than their roll off of their voters. So it's
really the relative roll off of voters and
non-voters and how that varies across groups
that would matter.

- Q. But you didn't do any of this analysis, correct, you didn't look at how --
- A. No, no, I didn't -- I -- I would not have had the ability to do the analysis in the basis of the data that was available.
  - Q. Why is that?
- A. Because, you know, when looking at -- so when I look at a vote -- if I look at a voter file from 2015 and I see who's on the -- who's on there in 2010, I don't -- you know, I -- I -- I just don't see the people who should have been there but weren't, and that's what I need to know in order to do these calculations.
  - Q. I don't understand. Can you --
- A. Well, there -- so there are some miss -- so -- so there's some missing

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO black non-voters would be too small and the estimate of black turnout would be inflated. Such a bias would tend to understate the change in black turnout between 2010 and 2014, which would work to favor the Plaintiffs' arguments.

Q. So for some reason this sentence confused me. I've read it several times and I'm trying to figure out what, exactly what you're saying.

So are you saying that if black voters roll off at higher rates --

- A. The hypothetical here is that black non-voters rolled off at higher rates.
- 15 Q. What if black voters rolled off at higher rates?
- 17 What really matters for these 1.8 calculations is, again, we want to know the 19 turn -- we want to know the turn -- we want 2.0 to know what the turnout of the group is. So if the groups -- if voters and non-voters of 21 a particular group are kind of equally likely 2.2 23 to roll off, then our sample of the people that are left over is representative and, 24 25 therefore, would have no effect in the

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016

Page 136

people, in the 2015 voter file there's some missing people. There are people who were el -- who were registered but didn't vote in 2010, there were some people who voted in 2010 but have left the rolls. In order to calculate the roll-off rates per groups, I'd need to know the racial composition of people that are not in the data. So I need to know what percentage of the roll off was black, what percentage of the roll off was white.

- Q. But don't --
- A. And I didn't -- for voters and non-voters and I didn't -- I didn't have that and I don't see how one would get that.
- Q. You don't have the racial data for the people who were in the voter file in 2010 but are no longer in the voter file in 2015?
  - A. That's correct, yes.
- Q. Haven't you in other cases done -at least one other case, I'm thinking about
  one of the Ohio cases, done your own race
  appending to data?
- A. Yes. But that involves me having the names and the locations of these invisible people.

Page 13

- O. And that's --
- A. Which I don't have.
- Q. Couldn't you have gotten that from Defendants in this case?
- A. Could I have gone back and asked them for a 2010 voter file?
  - O. Yeah.

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

1 2

8

10

1 1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1 9

20

23

24

- A. I -- I don't -- I don't believe so.

  My understanding was that Wisconsin just made available the current voter file. And that they did not have archived voter files. They only had the current voter file, that they did not have archived voter files. I mean, if -- if there had been archived voter files, the Plaintiffs could have obtained them as well and done the analysis without the problems of attrition. So...
- Q. Did you ask for archived voter files from the Defendants?
- A. I think I -- I don't think I asked specifically. I think I was told what was available. And then what was available was the data, the 2015 voter file, which had to be obtained through court order, because there was some

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016

Page 139

- A. That would be more roll offs. And there'd be more uncertainty about what the rates of turnout were in previous elections. It would obviously also affect some of the conclusions made by the Plaintiffs' experts who essentially used the same data without trying to even correct for the roll off.
- Q. Now, in critiquing Mayer's report, you only focus on two of his models. Why is
- A. Well, I focused on those two. I mentioned -- I mentioned that he does for another, but then argue that it doesn't I think effectively deal with the problem. I think it's mostly presentational by focusing on those two, I could raise issues that I needed to and then I simply noted that his other models do not address these issues directly.
- Q. Let's look at page 7, let's look at page 7 of your report, footnote nine. Do you see that footnote?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Do you see where you say, Catalist is a for-profit firm?

Page 138 confidential information in it So I -- I 1 2 don't know if I asked directly or just assumed, given what was apparently available 3 4 when I went to the website, that there wasn't one. So, so... 5 What can you tell me about 6 Ο. Wisconsin's list maintenance process? I have no direct information about 8 how they maintained the list. 9 10 And when I say "list maintenance," 11 what do you understand me to be referring to? 12 I'm assuming -- assuming you mean the process by which people get removed from 13 the voter file or from the registered voter 15 16 Ο. So you don't know how that works in 17 Wisconsin? 1.8 No. I don't. 19 And you don't know how officially it's implemented? 2.0 Α. No. I don't know. 21 2.2 If Wisconsin, in fact, engages in

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

regular aggressive list maintenance, would

that affect the roll-off problem that you

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016

Page 140

A. Yes.

23

24

25

1

2

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

23

24

- Q. But has long operated in the support of Democratic Party and progressive candidates.
  - A. It says "causes," but...
  - Q. Oh, does it?

identify in your report?

- A. Yes
  - Q. Why do you make that point?
- A. That there was not possible for me to obtain the data upon -- that they use directly. I had to depend on that that was provided to me through the Plaintiffs' case.
- Q. But why is the fact that Catalist is a for-profit firm relevant?
- A. I don't know.
- Q. If they're for-profit, doesn't that mean they have a monetary incentive to do a good job of matching --
- A. Yeah.
- Q. -- voters?
  - A. Yeah.

Did they have a good -- did they have a profit incentive -- well, they have a profit incentive to match voters, but my point was they -- they may have that

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

14

15

16

Page 142

Page 14

profiting center, but they don't have
profiting centers to sell --

- Q. To sell to you?
- A. To sell to me.
- Q. I gotcha.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

1 2

7

8

9

10

1 1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1 9

20

2.1

22

23

Did you do anything to check the Catalist data?

A. No, no, there's -- there's -- was not sufficient information in what they provided to know anything about their underlying model or how it was computed. In fact, when I went to the sources, I tried to consult, I suggested that it was a proprietary model. And I think that that's actually mentioned in Dr. Ghitza's report. So there wasn't really much I could do.

 $\label{eq:solution} So \ I \ simply took the stuff on race$  at face value, you know, and dealt with other issues that I felt were important.

Q. So I understand you're saying that with the information that was given to you, you felt like you couldn't check it, but aren't there certain external ways you could do at least some checking to see if Catalist was getting voters' race right?

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016 Nolan Mc

1

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

23

24

25

Page 143

data on partisanship.

Q. Now, we touched on this briefly in a slightly different context, but in at least one other case in which you gave expert testimony you did your own race appending, right?

A. Yeah. Yes, I did. That was a case where there was much more lead time and we were able to contract with somebody to do the necessary geocoding in order to -- to do the coding. That was not the circumstances I found myself in in this -- in this case. So I decided it was better to focus on other issues and rely on others.

Now, I would not -- I wouldn't -- what I did would not have matched Catalist, because they use presumably a different model. If they were just using the kind of off-the-shelf model that I used, they wouldn't call it proprietary. So even if I could or had time to do it, I thought it was probably just better just to not get into debates about the imputation of race, but to, you know, take Professor Mayer's data and show even taking that at face value, there's

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO Democratic Party and progressive candidates,
why do you make that point?

A. Simply to indicate that it wasn't
possible for me to obtain their data

done some spot checks like that, but I did

Q. And when you make the point that

Catalist has long operated in the support of

I mean, you know the race of some

Yes. In principle, I could have

possible for me to obtain their data
directly.

Q. Because you're not a -- you're no

Q. Because you're not a -- you're not a Democratic Party or a progressive cause?

A. Nor my -- my client is not.

Q. Okay. But you were --

Wisconsin voters, don't you?

A. I as a -- I as a person might be
able to estimate a case for given this data,
but not for this purpose.

Q. But you weren't making -- that
sentence was not meant to imply that the
Catalist data was false in any way?

A. No, no, no. It's just to indicate
why I wasn't able to obtain certain
information about the data and to obtain the

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

Page 144

April 14, 2016

some problems in the analysis that he did.

Q. And, in fact, Catalist -- this is one of the things that Catalist does as a regular part of its business, it's not a regular part of your business to append race data to voter files?

A. A regular part of my business?

Q. Yeah.

A. No, it's not.

MS. FROST: Why don't -- should we break for lunch, should we take a shorter break? What do people think? Let's go off the record for a little bit.

(Brief recess.)

15 BY MS. FROST:

Q. All right. Professor McCarty, are you familiar with something called the backlash hypothesis as related to repressive voting laws?

A. I mean, I understand the notion of backlash. I've not seen specific discussions about backlash related to repressive voting laws.

Q. And when you say you understand the concept of backlash, can you tell me --

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

2

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

23

24

Page 146

I looked at the, you know, election

over election changes at the municipal level.

backlash, one would expect to see the turnout

concentrated in those areas that had higher

One would expect to see, if there were

concentrations, potentially higher

concentrations in the voters who are

affected. I did not find a substantial

municipalities. But other than that, I

2014, which was the election involving a

So is it possible that the

different populations could be attributed to

that you saw in the Republican areas was an

indication of Republican support for Governor

Yeah, that's always possible.

So is it possible that the increase

increases in turnout that you observed in

highly polarizing candidate, correct?

increase in turnout in the most democratic

didn't -- did nothing that would reflect on

But, again, we're talking about

Page 14

A. Well, just generally people will refer to backlash as being something which a group mobilizes in response to something that they don't like.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

22

24

25

1 2

7

8

9

10

1 1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

- Q. And if -- if one were to apply -- if one were to find the backlash hypothesis applied to restrictive voting laws, might you expect to see an artificially high turnout in the election immediately following the changes to election laws?
- A. You would expect to find a high turnout among the group that was backlashing. So you might -- so you might to see, you know, in a hypothetical of that repressive voting laws targeted to group A, you'd expect to see disproportionate increases in the turnout of group A.
- Q. And have you done any research or analysis in that area?
  - A. No, I have not.
- Q. Did you do anything to control for the possibility in your analyses for this case the turnout in the 2014 election can at least, in part, be attributed to a backlash effect?

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016

Page

Page 147

April 14, 2016

- A. That's possible, yeah.
- Q. And is it possible that the increase in turnout that you saw among traditional Democratic constituencies could have been attributed, at least in part, to a backlash effect?
- A. Yeah, there are lots of stories one could construct, I suppose. I just don't -- haven't seen in this particular case evidence that that rationalize is defined in that I just described.
- Q. Okay. But you didn't analyze that, in particular?
  - A. No, I did not.
- Q. Now, let's look at Exhibit 2, which is the expert report that you prepared for this case. And let's turn to page 5, please. Now, on this page I'm looking at the last paragraph and -- actually, strike that.

I'm actually looking at the first paragraph. In the middle of the paragraph, I'm looking at the sentence that says, There was a U.S. Senate election in 2010, but not in 2014, however. This fact should work against higher turnout in 2014.

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO (866) 448-DEPO

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company

Page 148

Do you see that?

. Yes.

Walker; is that possible?

different things?

Α.

Q. What's your basis for that

- A. Well, that there was an additional high profile election in 2010 that would -- for which there was not one in 2014. Having a Senate race might have a modest impact on the turnout in a particular election.
- Q. Does voter turnout always increase when there is a U.S. Senate election on the ballot?
- A. No, I don't -- I don't think so.

  And I think on average, there might be a slight effect. But that means that sometimes there's a large effect, sometimes there's not an effect, but, on average, there's probably a small effect.
- $\ensuremath{\mathtt{Q}}.$  Okay. And what's that statement based on?
- A. The data that I have -- data that I have looked at, I've -- I've not published it anywhere, but, you know, several years ago I looked to see whether or not turnout was reflective of having a Presidential candidate

2

3

4

5

6

8

9 10

11

12

13

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

2

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

23

24

the first place.

Page 150

Generally, the best solution is

to use individual data. And, therefore, you

So aggregation bias happens when

And if you use aggregation -- if

you use aggregate data, what can you do, if

Well, you could include more

controlled variables for other factors which

might correlate with the outcome that you're

comparison across two points in time at this

same level of aggregation, because looking at

More controlled variables, or

comparing outcomes at two different points in

time in order to eliminate the effects of the

omitted variables that generate the bias in

that difference will control for many of the

unobserved factors that cause aggregation

bias. Those are the two main things.

interested in studying. You might do a

anything, to counter aggregation bias?

don't have aggregation hias because you're

using individual data.

you use aggregate data?

That's correct.

BY MS. FROST:

versus a Senate candidate on the ballot. I seem to recall there being a small positive impact of having a Senate election in the ballot.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

11

13

15

16

1 7

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2 23

24

25

1

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1 9

20 2.1

23

back up.

- Ο. Okay. Historically, has voter turnout in Wisconsin been higher in years when there's a U.S. Senate election on the
  - I don't know. I did not check Α.
- But turnout was higher in 2012 when there was no Senate candidate on the ballot, correct, we've established that?
  - That's true, yeah.
- Let's talk a little bit more about aggregation bias. You've already told me what aggregation bias is. How do political scientists counter aggregation bias?
- Well, usually the best solution to aggregation bias is not to use aggregate data, but to use individual level data. So you don't have run-in as the problem. (Off-the-record discussion.) THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'll just

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

Page 151

April 14, 2016

- And I take it you -- if I were to ask you did you do any of these things here, you would say I controlled outcomes at two different points in time --

  - -- correct?
  - That would be what I would say.
- What about the first part, that first option you said, which was to control for variables, did you do anything like that?
- I did not, I did not do that. Looking at two points in time essentially has -- has the effect of controlling for variables that don't change very much between those two points in time, but I did not control for any variables that might have changed between 2010 and 2014.
- But it doesn't tell you why those variables didn't change between those two points in time, correct?
- No. I mean, they -- I mean, the type of things that don't change from one point -- that don't change very much from one point in time are things like urbanization, the underlying populate -- the underlying

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

April 14, 2016

Page 152 populations, the voting locations, things of -- things of that sort. So I'm not trying to explain why they didn't change, I'm just taking as a fact that if you look at any geographic area in a four-year interval. there are lots of things that might affect turnout that just don't change very much from one election to the other. There are things that change and I did not -- was not able to control for them, but I did control for -implicitly for lots of things that might affect turnout, so... Features the underlying population, the local party structures, urbanization. The general locations of ballot polling places, they might have changed a little bit over time, but, in general, they probably didn't change huge amounts. So... So that's the best I could do,

> Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

because the individual level data was not

made available in this case. Otherwise, I

would have not done any of this stuff that I

did and I would have looked at the individual

level data on partisanship to see whether or

not Republican versus Democratic voters were

2

3

4

5

6

7

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

2.5

1

2

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

Page 154

Page 15

more or less likely to vote in one election than the other.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

22

24

25

1

8

9

10

11

1 2

13

14

15

16

17

18

1 9

20

2.1

23

- Q. But to give some examples of things that you didn't even implicitly control for, for example, how get out the vote efforts may have changed from 2010 to 2014, correct?
- A. Yeah. Would not have controlled if certain get out the vote efforts were more heavily concentrated in some areas versus others in 2014 than they were in 2010.
- Q. And you didn't control for how voters felt about Governor Walker between 2010 and 2014?
  - A. No, no, I did not use polling data.
- Q. What's the ecological inference problem?
- A. Well, the ecological inference problem is just simply a description of the problems of aggregation bias, that if we observe -- reserve an aggregate relationship where not logic -- it may be logically invalid to impute an individual level relationship from that.
- Q. So that it may not be valid to make inferences about individual behavior based on

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016

Page 155

data without making a firm conclusion about the individual relationship.

- Q. Now, when you talk about regressions with more controlled variables, to be fair, it's a little bit more than a suggestion, right? I mean, that's a well-accepted analytical approach to address this problem.
- A. Yeah, it doesn't eliminate the -it doesn't eliminate the problem, that's why
  I said suggestions.

Of course, the problem with using controlled variables is that -- I mean, ultimately, what you say you want to know is what -- you know, just give you one example why you might not want to do this. Suppose you wanted to just know the kind of the racial -- the racial impact. Well, you start including information about aggregate levels of education, aggregate income, all those things which might correlate with race, and you might be attributing some of the things that have to do with race through income, education, so forth. And so in that context you might not want to do it, that's why I

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO aggregate data, unless certain approaches are taken; is that correct?

- A. That sounds right, yeah.
- Q. And, in fact, isn't it true that even the direction of an inference can change?
  - A. Yes, in principle, yes.
- 8 Q. And political scientists have
  9 developed solutions to the ecological
  10 inference problem, correct?
- 11 A. They made suggestions on how to 12 deal with particular types of problems, yes.
  - Q. Okay. Can you give me some examples of some of those suggestions?
  - A. Well, some -- two of them I've already mentioned. One is, you know, running regressions with more controlled variables.

    The other might be to look at changes from one point in time, which has the effect of controlling for many of the things you would want to control for. There are more elaborate statistical procedures, such as that proposed by Gary King, which tries to leverage the information about the individual relationships that are implied by aggregate

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016

Page 156

said it's a suggestion for a particular context. It really depends what you want -- what you want to know.

Q. But doesn't Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act make all of those things that you just mentioned, educational attainment, income, all of those things, relevant to the question as to how these things impact --

MR. JOHNSON-KARP: I'm going to object to the extent it asks for a legal conclusion.

MS. FROST: That's fine.

13 BY MS. FROST:

- Q. You can answer.
- A. Yeah, well, the question was should I include controls for these things or -- that's different than the question of should one study whether higher or lower educated people vote or whether higher or lower income people vote. So I think they're slightly -- slightly different questions.

So if it's, if what you want to know is a racial impact, there's an open question as to whether or not you want to control for lots of things that are

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

2

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

23

24

25

April 14, 2016

Page 158

correlated with race

2

3

4

5

8

9

11

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2 23

24

25

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

1 4

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

If vou're interested in impact of educational attainment, there's an open question about how much you want to control for things that are incidentally correlated with educational attainment.

- Let's look at page 16 of your report, the first full paragraph. It's easy to find because the language I'm interested in is bolded and italicized.
  - Yes.
- So I am looking at the first full paragraph, which says, A more correct, but still possibly misleading version of Professor Mayer's statement would be "Controlling for vote history, African American registrants were more likely than other voters to vote in 2010."

Do you see that statement?

- Yes. Yes. I do.
- Ο. Can you explain to me why you think that it is important to add the words "controlling for vote history"?
- Yes. Because if you do not control for vote history, if it's not included in the

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016

Page 159

2010, but not 2014, while another voter, we're looking at the impacts of the law, didn't vote in either election?

You might want to know that, you might want to know that for certain -- for certain questions. That's not actually how the -- his models are set up. His models aren't let's look at all the people who voted in 2010, let's -- and then see whether or not they're -- African Americans were more or less likely to vote than white voters and then look at all the people who didn't vote, are African Americans more likely or less likely to vote, look at the subsamples.

What he does instead is he looks at the previous -- he measures the previous vote, he measures the previous vote history. something that's highly correlated with race, and uses that as a regressor in the regression. And so much of the impact of race in the 2010 vote is going to be picked up by this previous history.

I mean, I don't think it's controversial that African Americans voted at a lower rate than did whites in 2006, in

> Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

regression. African American registrants 1 2 would be less likely than voters -- than other voters to vote in 2010 3

Q. Isn't this just another way of saying that you think that the individualized analysis is misleading and the impact of these laws should rest entirely on aggregate analvsis?

No, I don't -- I don't think so. just -- I think sort of lay into my previous concern that, you know, what you want to what you want to know is whether or not the impact of laws changed the -- changed the likelihood that an African American would vote between 2010 and 2014.

Controlling for previous vote history, as I argue in that paragraph, kind of confounds -- confounds that relationship. So it doesn't have anything to do with the difference between individual and aggregate data. It just matters how one wants to specify the statistical model that's used.

O. If you're trying to analyze the effects of a law on a voter, would it make a difference to know that that voter voted in

> Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Page 160

2008, is to control elections. And, therefore, the impact that's going to -having something that's so highly correlated with race and including in the regression whether they voted in 2010 is going to downwardly -- is going to reduce the coefficient on race in 2010 toward -- toward zero. Or in this case actually, you know, make it possible that it's positive.

But you agree, I mean, I think you've now said it several times, that race is correlated with other variables that can influence turnout?

That's correct, yes.

For example, race is often correlated with residential stability?

Yeah.

And with economic status? Ο.

Yeah. Α.

> Ο. And educational attainment?

And, ultimately, isn't the very function of multiple regression techniques to control for these other variables?

Well, it's different than, say -- I

2

significant.

April 14, 2016

Page 164

Page 162

```
mean -- so stop me if this gets kind of too
 2
    in -- too into the...
             Okav
 3
        Ω
            There's a difference between -- I
 4
    didn't criticize him for controlling for
 5
    other things in the analysis. I -- I
 6
    criticized him specifically for doing
    something that we call running kind of a
 8
    lag-dependent variable. So did you vote is a
 9
10
     function of whether you voted.
11
             There are kind of well-established
    understandings about the cost and benefits of
     doing that. And I think in this particular
13
    context, there wasn't an appropriate -- it
14
     was an appropriate thing to do, that it
15
    was -- in and of itself it was too close to
16
17
     running the dependent variable on both sides
    of the -- dependent variable on both sides of
1.8
19
    the regression. If we run a regression of
    Y on Y, nothing else is going to explain
2.0
    anvthing.
21
              My argument here is that by
2.2
    controlling for vote history, he's -- he's
23
    going very close to running regression of
24
    Y on Y and so it's not surprising that these
25
```

## Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016

Page 163 in 2010 having an ID by 2015? 2 MR. JOHNSON-KARP: Object to THE WITNESS: I -- I -- I have no -- I have no idea. BY MS. FROST: Okay. Let's look at your report 8 again, Exhibit 2 in this deposition. And q let's talk about absentee voting for just a 10 minute. 1 1 Α. Okay. 12 Q. Turn to page 24, please. And I am

Α.

those?

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1 22

23

24

And these tables look a lot like Ο. Tables 1 and 2, which we discussed earlier. right?

looking at your Tables 4 and 5; do you see

That's -- that's right. Α.

Ο. And, again, so we're clear, the column titled Diff, this means the difference in percentage points, not the difference in percentage, correct?

That's correct, yes.

And your tables here show that

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company

(866) 448-DEPO

Ο So without the vote -- but if you 3 4 don't control for the vote history, don't you load the race factor even more? 5 Yeah, yeah, but -- but his point is 6 that there's no effect of race in 2010. And I'm just saying that that's only because he 8 controlled for the vote history that he found 9 10 that relationship. 11 How long is a Wisconsin driver's 12 license good for? I have no idea. 13 How many people had an 14 identification in 2010 in Wisconsin that no 15 16 longer have an identification in 2015? 17 I have no idea. 1.8 How many people who didn't have an 19 ID in 2010 now have one in 2015? I do not know. 2.0 Ο. Would you expect that number to be 21 2.2 higher, more people have IDs in -- or sorry, 23 scratch that. Would you expect that you would see 24 an increase of people who didn't have an ID 25 Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company

other factors are not statistically

correct? That's in the use of absentee voting. Okay. So in 2010, 6.1 percent of white registrants in Wisconsin voted absentee, while only 3.8 percent of black registrants did, correct? Α. That's correct, ves. Q. And that's a 2.3 percentage point difference? Yes If we look at 2014, now in the text

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

there's a disparity between white and black

voters in Wisconsin who use absentee voting.

of your report, you focus on the fact that as a share of registrants black usage of absentee voting more than doubled: is that correct? That's correct, yes. But even with that increased use, the disparity between white registrants and black registrants who voted absentee actually

increased from 2010 to 2014, didn't it? A. That's correct, because the rate of -- the baseline rate of usage for whites

> Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

1

6

7

8

9

Α.

Δ

April 14, 2016

Page 166

was almost double that of blacks in 2010

- So in 2014 a full 11.2 percent of white registrants used absentee voting, while only 7.6 percent of black registrants did?
  - That's correct, yes.
- And that's a 3.6 percentage point disparity, correct?
  - Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

Want to use the calculator? Just a matter of pride, isn't it, now?

As for Hispanics, if we look at Table 4, it shows that in 2010 there was a 4 point disparity between white registrants' and Hispanic registrants' use of absentee voting, correct?

- That's correct.
- And in 2014 that disparity increases to 7.2 percentage points --
  - Α. Yes.
  - -- right? Ω
  - Α. Yes.
- What do you make of the fact that your analysis shows that the disparity in turnout is actually increasing between white and minority voters using the absentee voting

# Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016

Page 167

at all in considering the impact of the election laws at issue in this case?

Well, so the -- it may be relevant. but I think it's not obviously relevant in --

in how it -- in how it cuts. So... If I recall, I believe it's Professor Burden's report stresses the increased usage or the high levels of usage of absentee votes by African Americans is a reason to believe that African Americans might be disproportionately harmed by these changes. The reason why that there's a continued disparity is that actually, in actuality, the rate of usage of absentee votes by blacks was much lower than whites. even before the laws, even before the laws changed. So I'm not sure what to make of. you know, the fact that -- that growing disparity was perhaps just simply a function of the baseline, the percentage changes, proportional changes were greater for blacks than they were for whites. And the relevance question is why there was a disparity in 2010? And I presume it did not have anything to do with the laws that were passed in 2012

> Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

in Wisconsin?

1

2

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

2

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

Well, I make of the fact that the white population is a population that's 3 traditionally at a higher propensity to use 4 absentee voting. Their increase was 5 proportionately less, but that 6 proportionately less increase still add to an absolute increase. It was bigger, because 8 the baseline was larger. 9

- But the disparity increased?
- The disparity increased, but the rate in which black voters turns to absentee voting was larger.
- So you don't think the disparity is meaningful considering the impact of the election laws at issue in this case?
- No, I think the, I think the most relevant thing is that essentially the odds at which a -- you know, a black voter transitioned to using absentee voting doubled and the white transition rate was not quite as high.
- So vou sav -- I think vou sav the most relevant or the most meaningful. Do you think the disparity is meaningful or relevant

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016

Page 168

and 2013. So I'm not sure how the disparity and the fact that it grew, despite the proportionally greater usage by blacks, cuts.

- Do you think the fact that there was a disparity in 2010 is relevant to the question of whether or not African Americans and Hispanics in Wisconsin have historically faced more barriers to voting than white
- Α. It's the -- I mean, there's a -- I mean, there's two possible interpretations. One is that there are barriers. One is that African Americans chose for whatever reason. to cast their ballots disproportionately in person relative to absentee.
- What about the turnout, the overall turnout numbers that we were discussing, do you think that's relevant to the question of whether or not African Americans and Hispanics have historically faced greater barriers to voting in Wisconsin than whites?
- Again, it is relevant to analyze whether or not such a preexisting disparity, what it says about Wisconsin's relative history in terms of barriers to voting. But

24

25

1

2

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

23

24

Page 16

I don't know if that differential in and of itself suggests differential barriers, or differential interests or differentials in demographics, but might -- it might affect voting. So...

So, yeah, I think it's relevant, but I don't know that it's dispositive.

- Q. Do you agree that our nation has a history of race based administration of facially neutral laws governing access to the ballot?
- A. Yes, there are historical evidence of discrimination related to the ballot, there's no question about that.
- Q. We're almost done. We're going to close out with one last exhibit.

MS. FROST: I'm going to ask that the court reporter mark this as McCarty deposition Exhibit 5.

20 (Exhibit McCarty-5, Rebuttal
21 Report, is marked for identification.)
22 BY MS. FROST:

- Q. Professor McCarty, have you seen this document before?
  - A. No, I have not.

#### Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016

Page 171

before?

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

15

16

17

1.8

19

25

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1 9

20

23

A. No, I have not.

 $\label{eq:Q.Did} \text{Q.} \quad \text{Did you just spend some time}$  reading it?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. I'm going to ask that you draw your attention, please, to page 6. And I'm particularly focusing -- or I'd ask you to take a look at the sentence, the first sentence in the last paragraph where Professor Mayer writes, There are two problems with his approach.

And in this sentence, understand the "his" to be your approach, Professor McCarty. And, specifically, what Professor Mayer is writing about here is your methods to show that the aggregate turnout increased between 2010 and 2014 for all races and in total.

A. Okay.

Q. Okay?

A. Okay.

Q. So Professor Mayer says that you concede that your weighting method works only as long as roll-off rates are uncorrelated

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Page 170 1 I'm only going to ask you a few 2 questions about the last pages, 6 and 7. if you want to take a few minutes to read it 4 Okav. I will represent to you that this 5 is, as it is titled on the front, a Rebuttal 6 7 Report that Professor Ken Mayer submitted in this litigation. 8 Α. Okay. 9 10 So do we want to go off the record 11 for a few minutes while you read? 12 I'm just going to ask you questions 13 about this Section V, McCarty's Weighting Method for Recalculating Turnout. 15 (At which time the Witness reviews 16 17 the document.) 1.8 (Brief recess.) 19 BY MS. FROST: All right. Professor McCarty, I've 2.0 just handed you a document that we have 21 marked McCarty deposition Exhibit 5. And I 2.2

> Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

this litigation. Have you seen this document

represented to you that this is a rebuttal

report prepared by Professor Ken Mayer in

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016

Page 172 with race at the voting district level.

Do you agree with that statement?

A. Yeah, it's a direct quote.

Q. And then he goes on to say that, If that, in fact, happens, if minority voters are more likely to fall out of the SVRS than white voters, the result would be an underestimation of the change in black turnout between 2010 and 2014, which would work in the Plaintiffs' argument.

Do you agree with that statement?

A. Yes, I believe it's a quote.

Q. Okay. So the next sentence is, The difficulty with his argument is that although this is an empirical question, the effects of a higher roll-off rate for minority voters is identical to a fall-off of turnout among minority voters who remain on the SVRS.

Do you agree with that statement?

A. No.

Q. Why not?

A. Well, to the extent to which I understand it, I don't. One of the difficulties I'm having in -- in parsing what he's written is he makes no distinction

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

2

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

23

24

25

2010.

Ο.

voters?

Page 174

between the roll off of voters and non-voters, which I think is crucial, which I think is crucial to this question. don't know whether he means a higher rate, roll-off rate of minority voters relative to minority non-voters, whether he means a higher roll-off rate of minority voters relative... So I -- I don't know if the -- I don't know what the relation is to. that's kind of crucial in answering this question.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2 23

24

25

1

2

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

2 4

- So he's referring -- what if he is referring to a higher roll-off rate for minority voters as compared to a roll-off rate for white voters?
- Assuming the same roll-off rates for the two groups among non-voters? Because that's -- that's sort of crucial.
- Why is that crucial? Because, essentially, what we want to know is if we look at the population of African Americans that are in the data in 2010, we'd want to know whether or not they're representative of other voters who are actually participated or could have

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

(866) 448-DEPO

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company

And that's because your tables --

participated in the 2010 election. So if

non-voters roll off at the same rates, then

representative sample. And, therefore, does

roll-off rates to white roll-off rates or any

50 percent -- suppose we observed -- suppose

50 percent turnout among African Americans in

we observe 50 percent -- suppose there was

2010 based on who was in the voter file in

of registered African American voters in

2010, suppose that half the voters dropped

off, then I computed the -- then I computed

when we're talking about your computations.

off, and then half the non-voters dropped

the turnout rate; on average, it would be

So, for example, suppose -- suppose

So 50 percent turnout of registered

Fifty percent -- 50 percent turnout

not depend on the relationship of black

voters -- if black voters and black

it's going to be representative, a

other roll-off rates.

April 14, 2016

Page 175

April 14, 2016

they distinguish -- well, no. This is where I don't understand.

When you're talking -- and I think we need to go back to, like, super basics --

- -- in listening to you.

Non-voters versus voters, how do you define, when you're talking about non-voters in this context, how are you defining a non-voter?

- The most simple way, someone who did not vote --
  - Someone who is registered to vote?
- Who is registered, but did not vote Α. in that election.
  - In a single election? Ο.
  - In a single election.
- Okay. And so then a voter is simply someone who's registered to vote and voted in that single election?
  - Yes.
- And for this context, which election are we talking about?
- So he's making reference to -- so 2014, this doesn't matter, I'm assuming

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

exactly 50 percent, as before.

Page 176

throughout that the 2014 voter records are -would have been almost identical to the 2015. So -- so this is really only about the 2010

So the -- in 2010, there were people registered, some voted, some didn't vote. Some of those who voted stayed on the rolls through 2015, some of those who voted left the roles before 2014 or '15, some of those who didn't vote staved on the rolls. some of those who didn't vote left the rolls.

- SO --Ο.
- What I want to know is like is the set of people who stayed on the rolls throughout 2015, is it representative of the people who actually were registered in 2010? Because the core -- the problem with all --
  - Right.
- -- all this is we don't know who 19 was registered in 2010, because we don't have 20 2.1 a 2010 voter registration file.
  - Let's talk a little bit about why people roll off the voter files. Okay? Will you agree with me it's pretty

unusual for someone to affirmatively act to Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

23

April 14, 2016

Page 17

cancel their voter registration?

2

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

2.2

23

24

25

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1 9

20

2.1

23

- A. Yeah. I -- I think that that's probably true.
- $\ensuremath{\mathtt{Q}}$  . And so why do people roll off the voter files?

What happens to cause someone to roll off the voter files?

- A. Well, they could move within the State of Wisconsin and reregister at a new address. And in this context, that would be treated, that would be treated as roll off.
  - Q. So that --
- A. No, actually, let me -- let me -I'm not sure whether that's true or not. Let
  me -- let me back up.
  I -- I don't -- yeah, I don't know
- how a change of address or change of jurisdiction is handled. So I'm going -- I'm going to retract that.
- Q. And you're saying you don't know
  how it's handled in Wisconsin?
  - A. I don't know how it's handled in Wisconsin.
    - Q. But as a general matter --
    - A. Not just how it's handled, how it's

### Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016

## Page 179

- $\hbox{A.} \quad \hbox{Yes, I report that they roll off at} \\$   $\hbox{different rates.}$ 
  - Q. Where do you report that?
- A. If they rolled off at the same rate
  I wouldn't have done the weighting, because
  the voter file would have been representative
  of those people who were eligible in 2010

of those people who were eligible in 2010. Oh, okay. So I -- I mean, I did not phrase it the roll off of non-voters greater than voters, but it's the second paragraph -- or the first full paragraph of page 8, I say that not -- oh, I actually, do say that, that non-voters roll off at higher rates, then I guess that's implicitly that they roll off at higher rates than voters, is documented in Tables 4 and 5 of Professor Maver's report. Table 4 reveals that the SVRS file undercounts registrants relative to the calculations of the Wisconsin Governmental -- Government Accountability Board by 736,610 or 21.3 percent of the total. But Table 5 reports that the SVRS underreports 2010 voters by 180,194 or 8.2 percent of the total.

> Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

So the pattern is exactly that

Page 178 reflected in the voter file Okay. But as a general matter, you would agree that mobility is -- mobility of the voters is one of the higher causes of roll off on a voter file? A. Oh. sure. Yeah. And African American voters, as a group, tend to be more mobile than white voters, correct? I don't know specifically. I don't know specifically to Wisconsin. That probably is as a national finding, but... Okay. And that's not something you looked at --Ο. -- specific --No. Ο -- to Wisconsin? Α. No.

Do vou have any reason to believe

because I think we're driving her a little

Please let me finish the question.

Do you have any reason to believe
that voters and non-voters as you define them
roll off the rolls at different rates?

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016

Page 180

which would produce upward biases in the 2010 turnout rates. So it's not entirely clear here, but it's simply the cause of the fact that registrants declined by 21 percent and voters only declined by 8.2 percent implies that the roll off of non-voters is about twice as big as the roll off of voters.

Q. What impact would it have if

- $\ensuremath{\mathbb{Q}}$  . What impact would it have if Wisconsin had an aggressive list maintenance program?
- A. Well, I mean, there would be more roll off. I don't know necessarily whether that would affect the relative roll off of voters versus non-voters or not -- or not.
- Q. You might know that if you knew how Wisconsin's list maintenance program worked?
- A. Yeah, if I had those details, I might be able to make a prediction about that, yeah.
  - Q. Okay. And although you say that --
  - A. I would -- I would -- oh, sorry.
  - Q. Please. Please go ahead.
- A. I would just imagine that almost any list management system is going to be one in which non-voters roll off more than --

2

3

4

5

24

25

1

2

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

1 9

22

2.3

24

25

Page 182

Page 18

more than voters, because if they had voted recently, then they probably are not the sort of person who might have moved or gone out of state, for which the list management system is supposed to pick up.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

1.8

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

6

8

9

10

1 1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

23

25

Q. But still you don't know -- scratch that, strike that. We've established that.

Okay. Let's look back at Professor

Mayer's rebuttal report. We're still on page 7 and now I'm looking at this last sentence in the first paragraph, If they do not roll off, but simply refrain from voting, we observe the same effect, which is a drop off in turnout from 2014 to -- or 2010 to 2014.

Do you agree with that statement?

A. In isolation, I don't know how to answer it in isolation, because it refers to the same effect. I'm not sure the effect in the previous sentence is one that I necessarily agreed to. But, yes, if voters who instead of rolling off simply refrained from voting, that would result in lower turn -- that would result in lower turnout.

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D. April 14, 2016

Page 183

changes challenged in this litigation themselves cause a higher roll-off rate for minorities?

- A. No. No, I didn't, I did not.
- O. Okay.

A. I -- I use roll-off rate, I use roll-off rate at the -- at the county level. So just in general -- so what matters is within a county whether there's differential roll off of minorities versus non-minorities, non-voters versus voters. I mean, it's kind of -- to say, it's kind of a forthright thing.

So for whatever reason, a heavily minority county rolled off a lot more voters, it could well be the case that there were more minority roll off, but that would not have affected my results, because I was looking at -- I was using roll-off rates specifically within -- within county, not across county.

Q. Okay. But you're not -- you didn't do any analysis and you're not offering any opinion about whether --

A. No.

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

2014, I'm reporting an increase. So I -- so 6 I find this very confusing, both because -because of that and the fact that I'm not 8 quite sure what he's arguing, because he 9 10 hasn't differentiated between the roll off of 11 voters versus non-voters and how that relates to the relative roll offs of voters and non-voters of other groups. 13 So I'm very confused as to what I'm 14 being asked to agree to. So --15 16 Okav. 17 -- I think I'd prefer not to agree. 1.8 That's fair. No. 19 Okay. What about the last sentence of this paragraph and the one I'm looking at, 2.0 It is likely that the voting changes 21 challenged in this litigation themselves 2.2 cause a higher roll-off rate for minorities. 23

It would look the same from the

One -- one of the things that

confuses me about this paragraph is I'm not

reporting a drop in turnout from 2010 to

numbers that you're looking at?

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

And my question for you is, did you do any

analysis to determine whether the voting

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016

Page 184

Q. -- the changes in the Wisconsin

A. No.

laws

Q. -- could have themselves caused increased roll off among African Americans?

A. No, I'm not.

Q. Or among any voters at all?

A. No, I'm not.

Q. Okay.

A. From my perspective, the roll off is kind of a nuance. They're trying to get the -- evaluate the claims that were made about turnout.

 $\ensuremath{\mathtt{Q}}.$  Those are all the questions. I have. Thank you very much.

A. Thank you.

MR. JOHNSON-KARP: I don't have

18 anything.

(Witness excused.)

20 (Deposition concluded at

21 approximately 1:19 p.m.)

(Signature Waived)

CERTIFICATE

I, Sharon L. Martin, a Notary public and Certified Court Reporter of the State of New Jersey, do hereby certify that prior to the commencement of the examination, Nolan McCarty, Ph.D., was duly sworn by me to testify to the truth, the whole truth and noting but the truth.

I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that the foregoing is a verbatim transcript of the testimony as taken stenographically by and before me at the time, place and on the date hereinbefore set forth, to the best of my

I DO FURTHER CERTIFY, that I am neither a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and that I am not financially interested in the action.

SHARON L. MARTIN, CCR, RPR CCR Number: 30XI00202100

Dated: 4/17/2016

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016 Page 2

[46.2 - agreed]

1

2

3

4

6

8

1.0

1 1

13

15

17

18

20

21

2.2

23

25

**46.2** 96:7 79-15 80-14 83-23 acknowledgements 23:12 121:10,23 131:24 179:12 acquire 115:17 132:7,21,23.24 5 3:21 32:19,23 8.1 130:4 acronym 53:5 157:16 158:1.14 43.11 13 57.21 58.3 8.2 179:24 180:5 act 79:20 156:5 159:10.13.24 167:9 96:12 129:25 71:18 110:3 147:17 167:10 168:6,13,19 176:25 **8.9** 96:22 163:13 169:19,20 acted 27:2 173:22 174:12,18 170:22 179:16,22 action 1:48:17 178:7 184:5 **5.3** 117:19 9.3 88:4 130:4 age 17:9,25 29:18 185:18.21 5.79 117:21 9:27 1:24 actual 122:4 29:18 91:4,16 92:4 5.8 129:19 actuality 167:14 92:5,24 93:18,24 110:3 add 24:3.11 132:12 96:47 11 15 17 **a.m.** 1:24 50 122:21 24 174:10 132:13 157:22 97:8.14 104:4.9 174:11,12,15,17,23 ability 135:12 166:7 116:24 117:14,18 50.2 96:17 185-14 added 7:9 114:15 117:20.21 123:5 able 7:1.19 55:6 53707-7857 2:18 adding 118:22 aged 97:16 72:8 78:7 104:1 54.5 96:4 aggregate 12:11,13 addition 54:1 **56.2** 87:23 115:16.25 142:18 additional 52:24 142:24 143:9 152:9 12:20 16:22,25 **59.1** 96:14 54:1 148:5 33:18 38:22,23 71:3 180:18 6 additions 118:19 72:6.7 75:15 76:12 absence 52:8,21 6 43:14 110:1.7 address 80:20 77:3,16,21 78:3 73:13 120:21,22 170:2 139:18 155:7 79:12 80:5 82:3 absent 73:15 18 171:7 177:10 17 113.8 17 115.21 absentee 11:19 **6.1** 164:6 administered 20:7 149:20 150:7.10 51:11 53:25 163:9 600 2:4 26:11,17 153:20 154:1,25 164.2 4 8 17 22 608 2:19 administration 155:19,20 158:7,20 165:3,14,25 166:5 62.2 89.9 166:12,20 167:9,14 64.3 86:14 aggregated 75:19 administrations 168:15 **65.5** 85:6,9 87:15 absolute 89:19 26:22 75:21 654-6256 2:6 admit 62:5 77:6 aggregates 78:18 114:21 166:8 aggregating 77:20 aggregation 77:19 68 3:17 126:7 absolutely 36:17 admitted 44:16 ads 108:5,7 77:23,25 149:16,17 7 72:2.25 102:25 academic 74:21 advantage 28:21 149-18 20 150-3 6 9 103:16 103:10 105:8 106:3 35:7.14 150:11.17.19 accept 22:12 139:20,21 170:2 advantages 28:6 affect 59:22 67:7,17 153:19 181:10 accepted 121:17 aggressive 138:23 155:7 **7.2** 165:18 70:10 75:12 76:15 180:9 **7.3** 85:6,9 86:8 **7.6** 165:4 access 25:3,7,21 114-2 2 127-22 ago 148:23 46:20 169:10 agree 9:1 14:12 19:4 132:16,17 138:24 700 2:4 accountability 139:4 152:6,12 25:6 26:3,16 70:13 70s 17:20 179:20 169-4 180-13 70:25 76:13 79:15 accrue 8:15 71.3 87:1 affirmatively 119:9 160:10 169:8 72.8 85:5,9 89:6 accrued 35:14 176:25 172:2,11,19 176:24 736,610 179:21 accrues 8:13.14 accurate 5:1 6:6,22 aforementioned 178:3 181:16 **7857** 2:17 acknowledged african 46:18 54:10 55:23 78:5,7,10,14 agreed 48:14 181:21 31:13 113:25

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

[05 - 43.3]			
0	<b>2.8</b> 129:7,20	159:1,9,21 160:5,7	
<b>05</b> 129:20	20 18:7,19 62:24	162:7,15,19 163:1	
1	118:5	164:6,23 165:1,12	
	<b>2000</b> 80:19 102:9	167:24 168:5	
1 3:13 19:20,21	103:22 104:14	171:18 172:9	
24:23 26:7 39:20	105:9 106:3 107:6	173:23 174:1,13,14	
41:12 81:21 82:8,14	128:7	174:19 176:3,5,16	
87:13 89:5 90:7	<b>20005-3960</b> 2:5	176:20,21 179:7,23	
91:7,10,17,23 93:15	2004 103:22 104:15	180:1 181:14 182:5	
102:19 103:2 122:20 163:17	104:17,20,21,23,24	<b>2011</b> 108:24	
	105:9 106:4,5 107:6	<b>2012</b> 17:15 20:14,15	
10 126:17 133:8 10.5 131:10	128:20	99:13,17 100:11	
<b>10.5</b> 131:10 <b>10.5.</b> 128:23 129:8	2006 126:20 127:15	101:4 109:3 149:11	
10.6 89:14	127:17 128:14	167:25	
10.8 129:24	129:6,19 130:18	2013 168:1	
10.6 129:24 100 127:25	131:4 159:25	<b>2014</b> 12:7 33:23	
100 127:25 11 81:23 82:8,9,14	<b>2008</b> 17:15 126:16	34:11 37:8,24 38:7	
86:6,7 87:5 102:21	128:17 129:18,22	38:12,20 39:2,13	
11.2 165:2	130:19 160:1	57:24 58:8,17 59:3	
11.2 163:2 111 85:25	<b>2010</b> 12:6 33:23	60:13 62:12 71:22	
111 65:25 12 43:4 126:17	34:7 37:4,20 38:3	72:1,16 73:3,11	
128:17	38:11 39:1,15 41:15	80:18,24 81:7,16	
13 91:3 95:25	41:15 57:24 58:7,17	82:15 83:1 84:5,18	
117:18	59:3 60:13 62:11	85:24 86:6,25 87:6	
13th 2:4	69:12,16 71:21 72:1	89:1,6,8,13,22	
14 1:18 128:18	72:15 73:2,11 74:2	96:14,20 97:20,22	
<b>15</b> 1:4 62:5 176:9	80:19,24 81:6,16 82:15 83:2,4 84:9	98:16,22 99:10,16 99:18,19,25 100:5	
150 1:23	84:12,19 85:25 86:5	101:22 102:9,25	
16 118:5 157:7	86:14 87:6,13,14	101:22 102:9,23	
169 3:21	88:2,7,12 89:18,24	108:11 109:7 111:4	
<b>17</b> 2:16 126:4	96:4,10 97:8,16	111:9 112:21	
<b>180.194</b> 179:23	98:7,22 99:9,19	114:19 115:5 117:4	
19 3:13 32:24 33:2	100:4,8 101:21	117:15,22 118:5	
79:4	102:25 103:10	119:4.23 122:2.20	
1:19 184:21	104:10 108:16	123:9 126:16	
2	111:4.9 112:21	128:21.22 129:4.10	
	114:20 117:3,15,20	129:20,25 130:5,15	
2 3:14 32:4,9,13 57:17 71:19,21 79:5	118:5 120:11.15	130:21 131:1,3,10	
82:11 91:2,8 92:3	122:2,20 123:9	131:10 134:5	
93:13 95:25 96:2	126:20 128:17	145:23 146:14	
97:7 102:22 104:6	129:20,24 130:3,4	147:24,25 148:7	
122:20 126:6	130:12,17,19,22	151:17 153:6,10,13	
147:15 156:4 163:8	131:1 134:4 135:18	158:15 159:1	
163:17	136:4,5,16 137:6	164:14,23 165:2,17	
2.3 164:11	147:23 148:6	171:18 172:9	
	151:17 153:6,10,13	175:25 176:1,9	
	157:18 158:3,15	181:14,15 182:6	
	Capital Reporting -	A Veritext Company	
	Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO		
(000) 440-DEPO			

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016

attributed 145:24

attributing 155:22

attrition 86:18.22

146:19 147:5

Page 3

April 14, 2016 Page 1

2015 55:3 126:14.18

127:14 14 135:17

136:1,17 137:23

162:16,19 163:1

176:2 8 15

2016 1:18 **202** 2:6 **21** 41:18 180:4

**21.3** 179:21

21.4 97:9

22 39:19 22.2 88:13 89:23

23 79.6 23.6 89:25

123:7

**29** 26:7

**3.8** 164:8 300 1.22

31 46:12

**32** 3:14 324 1:4

33.1 97:17 34 56:9

341 69:25

36.1 97:24,25

4.1 104:7.10 4/17/2016 185:25

42 3:15 43.3 88:7

4

4 3:6.17 24:22 25:11 68:20,21,25 70:2 79:2,3 88:7 163:13

165:12.12 179:16 179:17

30xi00202100 185:24

**24** 163:12 **25** 46:13 56:14

**26.1** 97:22 **267-8904** 2:19

3 3:15 42:4.5.10

45:12 50:18 126:3 128:8 **3.6** 165:6

[ahead - barland]

ahead 180:22 analyzing 35:20 85:4 129:16 aides 31:11 al 104:19 anita 1:5 alan 34:15.19 answer 5:4 6:10.16 6:17,22,23 7:6,15 allegations 56:25 altered 44:21 7:20 61:15,16 69:20 amended 56:24 132:9,15 156:14 american 21:5,10 78-5 10 14 79-16 answered 9.20.20 80:14 83:23 121:11 112:25 inswering 4:22 6:20 121:23 132:7,23,25 157:17 158:1 14 80.6 173.10 174:18 178:7 answers 4:24,24 americans 46:18 54:10 55:23 78:7 54:21 anybody 35:25 131:24 132:22 apologize 69:24 159:10 13 24 167:9 103.7 167:10 168:6,13,19 aponte 1:7 173:22 174:12 apparently 138:3 appear 58:7 70:8 184.5 amount 17:6 105:22 appears 62:3 append 144:5 106:3 113:1,2 amounts 152:18 appended 95:15 analyses 110:19 appending 136:22 111:3 116:9 145:22 143:5 apples 58:25,25 analysis 8:1,4 11:2,8 12:18 23:7 34:23 101:3,3 128:12,12 41-3 57-25 59-17 applied 145:7 60:24 68:11,13 applies 133:9 71:21 75:4 78:18.22 apply 9:5 145:5 approach 72:18 82-3 5 83-14 92-23 155:7 171:12,14 100:25 101:3,7 110:21 111:2,19 approaches 154:1 appropriate 58:24 115:4 21 116:6 13 117:9.12 130:9.11 135:10,12 137:16 approving 54:3 144:1 145:19 158:6 approximately 59:15 184:21 april 1:18 182-25 183-23 archived 137:11,13 analytical 16:12 137:14,18 analyze 11:23 area 13:17 18 14:2 129:14,15,15 74:25 145:19 152:5 147:12 158:23 areas 29:15 75:6 168:22 79:17.17.21.22 analyzed 11:25 13:2 146:5,23 153:9 argue 18:13 114:7 71:2,5 129:10 139:13 158:17

arguing 73:12 114:5 182:9 172:10.14 arguments 134:6 article 3:13,17 19:22 20:4,6,9 21:9 22:3,8,11,17,18,22 23:11.22 68:21 69:4 69:6,10 70:1 articles 21:18 artificially 145:8 ascertain 9:17 asked 56:1,3 104:20 137:5,20 138:2 182:15 asking 4:21 12:15 41:1 43:16 104:20 106:16 107:2 asks 13:19 156:10 assertions 72:13 assess 15:9 33:4 assessment 16:22,22 assign 22:3 assigned 75:25 associate 23:13,25 associated 77:20 86:21 association 20:16 assume 6:11 33:14 assumed 138:3 assuming 138:12,12 173:16 175:25 asymmetry 127:19 attached 3:24 attack 85:22 attainment 156:6 157:3 6 160:20 attempted 109:3 attempts 90:15 attention 24:25 25:23 26:8 32:18

90:13 126:24 129:23 130:6 137:17 audible 4:25 automatically 85:22 available 31:18 33:6 78:17,22 94:7,9 116:1 135:13 137:10,22,22 138:3 152:21 average 60:25,25 67:2 77:14 116:12 116:18 119:15 16 148:14,17 174:22 averages 17:2 38:18 116:19 119:14 aware 31:10,15 34:15 56:23 106:1,7 b **b** 3:10 back 41:20 44:21 45-13 48-11 49-11 57:14 61:12 98:3 105:5 128:25 137:5 149:25 175:4 177:15 181:8 backlash 144:18,21 144:22,25 145:2,6 145:24 146:4 147:6 **backlashing** 145:12 **ballot** 18:12 25:3,7 25:20 31:8 35:15 46:21 59:5.8.11 102:17 148:12 149:1,4,8,12 152:15 169:11.13 balloting 11:19 51:12 53:25 ballots 9:7 54:3 57:14 70:4 171:7 ballpark 63:9 attorney 4:13 50:21 barland 1:11

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

50:23 53:16,20

185:16,19

[barriers - case] barriers 168:8,12

168-21 25 169-2

based 71:10 72:6

75:15 79:7,8 81:25

81-25 82-3 5 83-19

91:17 98:19 104:2,3

86:16.17 90:20.21

116:11 119:20

128-21 130-3 17

148:20 153:25

169:9 174:13

baseline 164-25

166:9 167:20

baselines 114:22

basic 12:17 83:7

basics 175:4 basis 74:4 78:24

83:21 115:24

148:3

bay 40:12

begins 25:19

behaved 119:4

behaves 77:4

119:11

118-18 135-13

becoming 8:21,21 beginning 25:11

32:25 61:12 120:20

behave 36:15 79:16

hehavior 12:5 16:17

76:23,24 77:11,21

78:3.3.11 99:25

behaviors 76:5,7 believe 17:17 20:23

29:20 31:2 41:24

43-22 51-3 53-1 4

53:22 55:2 56:9

63:1 64:3 89:25

108:13 111:21

117:11,12 131:24

benchmarking 93:9

137:8 167:6,10

172:12 178:23

35:23,23 70:9 76:17

basically 14:1 85:23

calling 67:6 124:14

campaign 113:3.5.7

cancel 177:1

cancelled 62:3

candidacy 119:25 candidate 34:2

35:12.15.24 36:9.22

36:23 37:17 59:14

106:6 107:9,20

108:12 146:15

148:25 149:1,12

candidates 29:3

36:5 19 106:15

140:4 142:8

capacities 1:15

capitol 108:24

capitalized 94:23

careful 32:8 93:22

carnegie 1:21,22

case 1:3 11:12,24

30:20 32:17 41:24

43.6 9 24 44.3 18

44:24 45:2,6,9,11

45:14 46:2,4,5,23

48:8,9,23 49:12,13

52:12,15,17,24 53:1

49:16,22 50:6,20

53:6 10 14 23 24

54:5,6,12,24 55:1,5

55:15,16 56:2,8,12

56:24 57:15 67:12

71:3 73:10 75:17.17

78:12 82:10 95:23

111:23 118:12.24

133:13,16 136:20

142-18 143-4 7 12

145:23 147:9,17

106:11 110:20

127-2 130-22

137:4 140:12

152:21 160:8

166:16 167:2

51:6,7,14,21,22

47:3,3,6,8,13,25

carries 8:6,6

carry 17:5

block 12:24

blowout 59:21

**bolded** 157:10

86:13 102:23

120:23

144:11,12

**breath** 82:12

broader 99:2

**bump** 101:21

burden 121:25

burden's 167:7

hurdens 125:6

bush 104:19,25

c 1:10 2:1,3 4:1

34:20 185:1.1

**c.v.** 41:25 43:3,9

calculate 90:6.16

93:13,14 136:6

calculated 93:23

calculation 14:18

127:10 135:1

calculations 94:6

135:22 179:19

call 21:18 126:23

143:20 161:8

called 69:4 94:15

165:9

144:17

133:9,12 134:18

calculator 88:16,17

17:12 18:14 97:4,5

45.13 53.1

105:2,2 106:4,18

business 144:4,5,7

**bulk** 130:8

bunch 57:4

125:7

170:18

143:2

box 2:17

board 22:7 179:21

hottom 32:24 33:1

break 6:14,18 57:6

57:10 61:6 71:11

brief 57:11 144:14

briefly 43:19 55:14

8-13 14 11-1 2

14:18 18:14,15

28:10 68:10,13,15

henefits 8:681215

est 5:8 29:23 30:2

118:18 124:12

149:19 150:1

152:19 185:13

better 4:11 54:23

65:8 143:13 22

bias 77:19,23,25 129:11 134:3

149:16.17.18.20

150:3,6,11,20,24

biased 90:18 127:11

big 17:8 18:21 59:25

bigger 66:23 125:23

bit 21:12 57:23 61:6

70:15 73:5 74:7

144:13 149:15

152:16 155:5

black 81:15 82:20

96:7.11.17.21

116:24 117:3.14

118:1 119:1 122:2

134-2 4 11 13 15

165:4 166:12,19

172.8 174.2 2 6

123:17 130:12,14

165:1 167:15.21

blacks 114:19

128:3 133:24 134:1

136:9 164:1,8,16,22

83:7,12,16,17 87:24

88:3.25 89:8.11.14

106:13 111:7 125:6

beyond 33:2

153:19

biases 180:1

131.9 180.7

166:8

bill 108:25

176:22

41:13 52:8 101:1,15

[cases - computer]

cases 54:24 74:22

95.14 129.17

cassandra 1:7

catalist 83:20

139:24 140:13

143:16 144:2.3

142:14 150:19

caused 11:9 13:3

causes 140:5 178:4

caught 61:10

183:2

184:4

141:7,24 142:7,22

cause 19:16 124:19

177:6 180:3 182:23

136:19.21

cast 168:14

77:6,11,14 80:8,12

caveat 131:14 ccr 1:25 185:24,24 ceiling 127:24 census 12:24:24 13:19 83:22 93:20 center 1:21,22 141:1 centers 141.2

central 115:9.10 certain 9:23,25 30:11 31:14 80:2,3 141:23 142:24 153:8 154:1 159:5,6

certainly 10:2 23:5 36:13 101:9 132:12 certified 185:3 certify 185:4,9,15 cetera 128:18 challenge 44:4

challenged 49:4 52:17 100:15 102:6 182:22 183:1

challenges 51:8 chance 116:25,25 change 9:7,11 10:20 11.3 12.8 13.3 14:23,24 15:2,4,6

15:13,18,20 18:5,13 18:21.23 19:15 30:3 30:5 36:9,11 51:10 60:11 62:7 65:16

143:11 citizen 1:4 93:18,18 93:24 104:2.3 121:6

checks 142:4

22:2 69:13,18

choose 63:20

chosen 27:17

circuit 50:12

circumstances

chief 20:19 21:1 16

choice 115:23 131:2

chronological 43:21

circles 39:24 40:4.9

17-22 95-8 124-12

chose 17:23 30:17

115:19 168:13

comes 86:20 commencement 185:5 116:24 117:3,17,19 commencing 1:23

107:15

come 24:2 107:21

depends 14:23

132:18 156:2

denosed 4:16

66:10,11,24 67:8

5:13 19:20 42:3

April 14, 2016 Page 5

comment 21:17 citizens 91:5,16 92:4,5,24 96:4,8,12 commenting 22:22 comments 23:14,22 109:24 117:16 17 119:12,14 125:3 134:4 151:14,19,22 96:15,18 97:8,11,14 24:1,4,5,6,12,13,16 151-23 152-3 7 9 17 97:16 104:10 24.19 117:14 118:1 121:5 154:6 172:8 177:17 communities 124:17 121:7,8 citizenship 13:14 177:17 community 8:16 changed 19:16 55:7 118:16 124:10 claim 80:20 125:10.11 151-17 152-16 claimed 49:1 comparative 21:6 153:6 158:13,13 claims 33:4 49:10 compare 76:24 167:17 71:9 184:12 88:10 89:23 101:3 changes 9:15.17 clarification 11:14 101:14.19 102:8.14 10:3 11:8,17,18 clarified 7:10 121:18 128:12 clarify 5:20 40:19 ompared 12:5 83:2 12:7 13:8 14:18 46:7,10 51:11 52:4 clay 55:13 97:15 98:8 121:11 55:20 58:15 71:25 clean 100:3 clear 5:16,16 81:24 73:1,9,15,18,21 129:7,21 173:14 74:17 75:1 76:10,17 84:20 91:22 163:20 compares 130:11 77:13 78:13 79:18 180:2 comparing 58:25 clearly 10:25 93.2 100.1 5 114.21 77:18 100:4 130:9 client 142:15 124:22 145:10 150:22 146:2 154:18 close 19:4 109:14 comparison 58:5,6 167:12 20 21 161:16.24.169:16 58:23 60:6 79:5 closely 114:10 99:19 100:4 101:16 182:21 183:1 184:1 changing 8:9 51:8 closer 87:12 110:6 102:2 106:16 chart 102:23 123:6 121:14 122:6 coalition 43:7 53:2 check 36:8 141:6.22 149:9 coding 143:11 comparisons 58:7 checking 141:24 122:12

cody 1:5 competitive 3:19 coefficient 160:7 coie 2:34:13 college 29:11 column 82:23,24 83:4.6.11 84:4.5.9

competitiveness 112:5.15 84:13,22,22 85:4,14 complaint 56:23 87:13 89:5 103:13 completely 7:6 composition 25:14 104:7,7 163:21 columns 82:19 25:25 26:4.13.19.25 combination 53:15 27:6 20 28:4 5 11 combined 51:7 29:25 63:15 136:7 compress 128:4

computations 174:25 computed 141:11 174:21.21 computer 94:11

68:22 69:5 70:6

112:9,9

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

[computers - current]

computers 94:16 concede 171:24 109:22 conceded 48:10,12 concentrated 146:5

153:9 concentrations 146:6.7 concept 144:25 concern 60:23

48:19

158:11 concerned 77:19 78:2 conclude 49:19 52:2 concluded 49:22

184:20 conclusion 49:4 15 50:3 74:5 101:23 130:24 155:1 156:11 conclusions 139:5

conducive 124:11 conduct 106:22 conducted 83:20 106:20 110:20,21 111:1,3

confident 56:16,18 56:18 confidential 138:1 confirm 120:19 confounds 126:7

158:18,18 confused 134:8 182-14 confuses 182:4

confusing 68:8 182:7 congressional 44:4 44-19 20 49-13

consequences 25:2 25:8,20 conservative 29:16 29:17 consider 73:23 74:9

considerably 62:20 62:20 63:12 considering 166:15 167:1

consistent 81:3 constituencies 28:8 28:9 110:11 147:4 constitution 45:8 47:18,19 construct 147:8 consult 141:13 contact 55:3 contacted 54:25 55:12 contention 113:4 contentious 110:5

consultations 56:20 contested 59:5,23 ontext 18:21 27:1 56:2 66:11,15,24 70:6 114:14 126:12

143:3 155:24 156:2 161:14 175:9,22 177:10 contextual 26:23 continuation 81:3 continue 25:10 continued 167:13 contract 143:9 contrary 72:13 control 76:2 93:5 110:18 112:4,6,10 121:6 132:5 145:21 150:18 151:9,16 152:10,10 153:4,11

162:4 controlled 44:8 47:11 150:13,21 151-3 153-7 154-17 155:4,13 162:9 controlling 113:9 130:13 151:13 154:20 157:16,23 158:16 161:5,23

controls 156:16

108:20 159:24

controversial

154:21 156:25

157:4,24 160:1,24

conversational 5:12 convey 82:23 83:11 core 176:17 correct 6:2 19:8 22:19.20 23:19 24:14 31:20 33:24 36:24 48:15 49:24 52:12 53:4 62:9 10 62:13,24 63:1 66:3 74.6 76.21 79.9

33:25 34:2 36:16,20 71:4,17 73:19,21,22 81:17 82:6,7 83:3 83:25 84:24 85:2,8 85:10 86:12.18 87:3 87:16,17 88:5,15 89:6,7,16 90:13 91:6 92:7 94:4 96:5 96:6.9.13.15.16.18 96.19 23 97.18 19 98:2,7,24 99:10 100:17,22,23 102-17 103-1 17 104:11.12 105:3 108:25 109:1,4,5 117:23 118:1 119:18,19 120:7,8 120:12 121:2 3 124:7 133:12 135:10 136:18 139.7 146.15 149:13 150:8 151:6 151:20 153:6 154:2 154-10 157-13 160:14 163:23.24 164:3,9,10,18,19,24

150:14 155:21

36:25 132:7

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company

(866) 448-DEPO

cost 8:1 4:20:21:22 8:24 9:11,18 10:10 10:24 11:1,2 14:18 14:23.24 15:2.6 18:4,14 68:10,13,15 161:12 costs 3:17 8:20,23 9:2,9,25 10:4,21 13-2 15-13 21 16-3 16:14 17:10 68:22 69:4 counsel 2.8.21 185:17.19 ount 43:5 counter 149:18 150:11 counteracted 60:20 61:19 counterfactual 73-14 17 111-17 114:17 county 12:23 90:21 90.23 132.4 183.7 9 183:15,20,21 couple 131:5 course 119:10,13 120:5 126:12,17 155:12 court 1:1 4:22 5:5 19:19 32:3 34:17 44-14 47-2 48-6 49:21 50:7,12,13 51:18 53:7 54:16 94:20 137:25 169:18 185:3 cover 24:2 covered 73:5 165:5,7,15,16 178:9 correcting 90:17 criticize 99:24 161:5 correctly 85:18 correlate 10:14 criticized 161:7 critiquing 139:8 cross 10:14 57:4 correlated 157:1.5 crossover 37:15:21 159:18 160:3,12,16 37:25 correlates 16:17 crucial 173:2,3,10 correlating 10:18 correlation 35:1 173:18.19 current 13:19

April 14, 2016

Page 6

121:20 122:6 137:10,12

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016 Page 7 123:10 11 128:6 19

[curriculum - disparate]

curriculum 3:15 42:6,13 cut 5:8 33:1 cuts 167:5 168:3 cv 1:4

d d 3:1 4:1 11:16 84:15 dashed 41:6 data 9:22.25 12:11 12:12,14,17,20 15:9 16:25 25 33:10 13

33:18 40:17.23 41:2 41:7 63:6 71:3,6,7 71:10 72:6,7 75:16 77:3 78:17,19 79:12 80:5 82:1,3,6 90:6,8 93:12.16 94:3 99:7 99:8 105:14 114:16 115:13.19 116:1.2 116:17.18 121:17 121:25 122:1,4 126-13 132-1 4 135:13 136:8,15,22 137:23 139:6 140:10 141:7 142:11,18,22,25 143:1,24 144:6 148:21.21 149:21

149:21 150:2.4.7.10 152:20.24 153:14 154:1 155:1 158:21 173:22 date 185:12 dated 185:25 david 1:6,7

day 98:1 days 10:9 46:12,13 dc 2:5 deal 38:16,17 139:14 154:12 dealt 51:10 53:24 141:18

debates 143:23 decades 37:2 december 55:9

decide 48:20 decided 22:12 143:13 decision 8:4 22:18 50:13 decisions 7:25 decline 9:3 10:1

30:7 31:5

137:19

147.10

definitely 63:22

definition 19:9

definitions 84:2

deleterious 54:9

degree 29:11 131:2

demobilizing 113:5

29:11 50:19 110:10

146:9 147:4 152:25

demographics 29:6

democratic 11:12

140:3 142:8,14

demonstrate 54:8

denominator 93:17

97:12,13 121:9

department 2:14

dependent 161:9,17

depending 27:15

depend 66:4,5

140:11 174:6

161:18

66:15

62:7 169:4

72:13

44:12 46:25 47:1 11:10 13:4 72:15 48:4 51:16 54:14 78-4 122-1 57:17 17 68:19 71:20 96:3 102:22 declined 180:4,5 decrease 10:24 19:5 126:5 163:8 169:19 28:16 170.22 184.20 decreased 19:3 depositions 5:23 decreasing 28:8

depress 73:10 113:3 depressed 71:25 defendant 46:1 73:2.13 defendants 1:16 describe 132:15 2:21 45:2,4 137:4 described 63:10 74:15,16 90:12,18 define 65:5 83:15 90.25 94.3 147.11 175:8 178:24 description 3:12 defined 83:17,18 defining 175:10

**despite** 168:2 **detailed** 23:14,21 details 55:18 180:17 determine 80:2 182:25 determined 55:5 9 deterrent 9:19 detrimental 51:25 52.3 detzner 43:23 47:7

47:22 49:12 developed 154:9 deviate 17:3 deviations 95:20 dewine 51:3,4 53:21 diff 84:13 85:5 103:13 104:7 163:21 differ 58:21 62:15 67.4

differed 59:19 difference 19:7 59:2 62:24 63:3 84:16.16 84:23,25 86:4,10 89:20 91:7,14 96:25 97:17 112:22

128:23 150:18 158:20,25 161:4 163:21.22 164:12 deposition 1:20 5:1 differences 63:13,24 75:14 76:25 110:23 111:8,10 115:2 different 70:22 76:1 76:16 91:9 102:8 114:22 121:5 143:3 143:17 146:19.20 150:22 151:4 156:17,21 160:25 178:25 179:2 differential 169:1,2 169:3 183:9 differentials 169:3 differentiated 182.10 differently 79:16,20 difficult 7:14 28:24 80.3 difficulties 172:24 difficulty 172:14 direct 48:25 49:9 120:18 138:8 172:3 direction 132:18 154:5 directions 119:14 directly 138:2 139:19 140:11 142:12 dis 127·19 19 disagree 107:8 discrimination 169:13 discussed 62:11 74.23 163.17 discussing 168:17 32:20 discussion 110:25 149:23 discussions 144:21 disgust 60:5 disillusionment 60:5

disparate 80:22

39:16 51:8 59:3.20

60:15 61:3 62:8 16

64:17,17,25 65:17

66:16,20 67:3,5,9

67:13 73:21 74:20

75:2,6 77:7,7,12,12

99:14.21.21 100:2.4

100:11.22 101:4.6

103:21,24 104:14

104:18 105:10 16

107:6 108:3 110:5

111:15 112:5,8,11

112:12 115:6 119:5

128:21 129:5 130:17,19 131:11

146:14 147:23

145:9,10,23 146:1,2

148:6,9,11 149:3,7

152:8 153:1 159:3

166:16 167:2 174:1

175:15,16,17,20,23

elections 3:19 13:15

14:9 17:14 26:11,17

176:4

101:13 102:8,11

79:18 80:2,8,13

83:1,3 84:7,12

[disparity - electorate] disparity 81:13,14 88-2 12 22 25 89-13

89:17,21,24 96:10

96:21,24 97:21

123:8 164:1 21

165:7,13,17,23

166:10,11,14,25

dispositive 169:7

dispro 127:16

disproportionate

167:13,19,23 168:1

16:8 133:15 145:16

disproportionately

46:18,20 55:22

167:11 168:14

dispute 131:11

distinction 172:25

distinguish 72:8

district 1:1,1 53:7

133:24 172:1

districting 44:5

doctor 4:11

districts 50:4 76:1

document 19:18,25

20:2.3 32:2.12.16

111:17 114:10

126:4 169:24

170:17,21,25

14:7 179:16

doing 5:10 8:25

12:10 16:24 75:4

76:7 83:14 85:11

95.17 101.2 102.2 3

114:3 115:4 126:18

doi.state.wi.us 2:20

dots 40:6

double 165:1

[faster - glasses]

faster 132:24

fault 69:22

127:1

134.9

93:14

doubled 164:17

documented 13:25

documents 6:21 7:2

42:2,9 57:18 68:18

175.1

127:6,7,18 133:19

doubt 106:10,13 downward 129:11 downwardly 160:6 dr 95:8 141:15 drafted 24:17.17

draw 24:25 25:22 26:8 32:18 70:3 171:6 drawing 78:2 drawn 49:3.6.8.18 driven 131:1 driver's 162:11 **driving** 178:21 **drop** 181:13 182:5 dropped 48:9 174:19,20 due 55:4 110:8

119:23 duly 4:3 185:6 duty 8:14 dynamics 60:14.19 60:21 61:17,19,24

e 2:1,1 3:1,1,10 4:1 4:1 11:16 185:1,1 earlier 62:22 64:4 67:25 74:16.23 111:13 127:10 163:17 early 11:17 46:8,10 46:11.19 51:10 easier 5:5 28:23 35:11 easy 157:8 ecological 153:15,17 econom 29:16 economic 160:18 economically 29:17 editor 21:8.16 22:2

22:4.4.13 23:9.14

23:17,25 24:20

editorial 22:7

finding 109:23

178:12

editors 20:18:20

21:1,2,3 23:13,18

69:13

24:3 69:17 educated 29:10 63:23 156:18 education 1:4 29:13 155:20.24 educational 156:6 157:3,6 160:20 effect 11:4 14:22 15:1,24,25 31:19 33.7 22 35.4 17 20 36:1,2 52:1,3,6,9,15 52:20,21 54:9 67:20 75.6 8 93.5 100.16 111:8 114:5.7.11 115:11 116:8

127:24 128:9 134:25 135:1.2 145:25 147:6 148:15,16,17,18 162-7 181-13 19 19 effective 108:7 130:15 effectively 30:17 139:14 effects 14:19 33:17 60:25 61:1 66:14 70:8.22 113:5.6 115:1,12 125:23

27:14 33:23 34:1 36:16 55:25 57:24 133:11 150:23 58:21,22,23,24 59:5 158:24 172:15 efforts 107:25 153:5 59:15 20 23 24 60:1 153:8 60:17 62:12,15 63:4 efrost 2:7 63:12,16,17,21 eight 123:16 68:23 69:5 80:4 either 21:1 30:6 93:25 101:15.18 103:17,18 105:25 111:4 115:24 126:1 64:25 159:3 el 136:3 elaborate 154:22 126:16 127:10 elect 36:5 128:10 129:1 9 elected 45:18 50:24 131:22 139:3 160:1 108:16 109:6 electoral 9:8 10:20 election 8:7 9 11:9 10:22 18:21 36:2 4 12:6,8 13:3,7 18:8,8 55:20 58:15 67:6 18:12,17,23 19:5.7 71:25 73:1,9 19:9.12.15.16 26:22 electorate 25:15

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

27:10.16 30:5 35:11

36:20,22,23 38:21

[electorate - far]

28:12,17 29:19 30:1 60:15 63:15 25 64:2 76:15 77:5 electorates 63:21 eligible 93:10 102:24 103:4 126:20 179:7 eliminate 93:11 150:23 155:9,10 elisabeth 2:3 4:12 elsa 1:11 empirical 9:6,13 11.5 14.16 172.15 employee 185:16,19 enact 27:10 enacted 30:10 ended 110:6 endorsement 23:8 endorses 35:19 engage 55:18 engaged 24:9 63:18 engagement 125:10 engages 138:22 enhance 10:20 ensure 4:25 enthusiasm 60:2 enthusiastic 107:24 entire 91:11 93:10 entirely 101:22 158.7 180.2 entitled 82:14 equal 60:22 68:16 equally 134:22 erroneously 122:1 error 17:6 109:9,15 109:17,20 122:10 especially 127:1 esquire 2:3,15 essentially 17:2 76:10 95:9 104:3 112:12 139:6

151:12 166:18

established 123:9

149:13 161:11

[go - identification]

go 10:12 19:13

22:18 49:11 75:21

128:25 144:12

170:10 175:4

181:7

estimate 16:18 82:24 83:20 84:6 11 86:16,19 87:17 116:12 126:15 128-5 129-11 133:25 134:2 142:18 estimated 41:7 estimates 16:16 87:19 115:14 et 128:18 ethnic 82:25 83:13 evaluate 31:18 33:5 75:13 77:13,17 184:12 evaluated 71:8 81:8 evaluating 76:9 80:7 evaluation 75:1 76:8 evaluations 13.7 event 120:9 everybody 128:2 evidence 29:24 30:2 30:13,14,16 31:18 33:6 48:2 49:4 51:23,25 52:7,9,19 52:21 54:7 71:24

72:25 73:7.13 74:1 74:2 80:16 81:9 101:24 110:15 113.6 18 114.4 6

118:13 147:9 169:12 evident 122:3 exact 68:16 exactly 9:13 18:3 50:3 83:17 93:16 94:18 95:17 134:9 174-23 179-25 examination 3:4 4:6

185:5 examined 4.3 example 13:17 18:6 66:6 78:4 85:3 107:13.19 129:16 133:23 153:5 155:15 160:15

134-20 22 145-3 12

80:10 82:15 83:1.14

84:8,12 88:24 90:16

145:15,17 178:8

groups 11:21 31:6

external examples 10:6 153:3 154:14 141.23 extrapolate 112:1 exclusively 123:13 extrapolated 11:6 excuse 50:10 extrapolating 111:25 excused 184:19 executive 1:22 extreme 16:1 exercise 122:11 extremely 64:24 exhibit 3:12 19:21 101:5,8 106:5 24.23 26.7 32.4 9

32:13 42:4,5,10

45:12 50:18 57:17

68:20 21 25 69:3

70:2 71:19 82:11

96:2 102:22 126:6

147:15 163:8

169:16.19.20

exhibits 3:24

exist 121:19

existed 62:4

123:20

expanded 7:9

162:21.24

expect 111:7 145:8

145:11,15 146:3,4

expenditure 113:5,8

expenditures 113:7

expert 3:14 5:23,24

5:24 11:11 12:25

32:9,17 41:22 42:15

42.19 44.16 48.22

49:1 51:21 52:25

54:4,6 56:4,12,13

74:9.24 95:22 96:1

xperts 48:3 49:10 115:2,17,18,18

143:4 147:16

explain 114:25

152:3 157:21

explicitly 31:5

extent 9:16 24:5

26:20 35:4.8.9

112:14 121:19

156:10 172:22

139:5

161:20

170:22

April 14, 2016

70:5

Page 9

f 84:15.15 185:1 face 141:18 143:25 faced 168:8.20 facially 169:10 fact 13:24 14:6,7 31.14 52.15 60:8 12 62:4,5 63:11 65:25 78:1 90:13 91:8 95:14 106:4 107:13 108:22 110:4,8,9 118:21.24 122:17 138:22 140:13 141:12 144:2 147-24 152-4 154-4 164:15 165:22 166:2 167:18 168:2 168:4 172:5 180:3 182:8 factor 29:18 107:14 162:5 factors 14:24 19:13 107:11.15.16 125:18 150:13.19 162:1 facts 80:23 fair 23:16 60:9 155:5 182:18 fairly 27:24 faking 69:24 fall 98:17 172:6,17 falls 18:1 false 142:22 familiar 7:23 9:23 105:4,20 144:17 far 50:15 53:8 56:8 85:11 113:1

April 14, 2016

Page 11

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016 Page 10

26:1,5,13,19,25

27:6,16,20 28:4,6

findings 113:12 favor 32:5 134:5 favored 30:7 finds 130:12.15 feature 126:25 fine 61:21 156:12 finger 32:6 finish 5:3 6:17 features 10:22 124:10 152:12 43:16 69:19 99:2 fec 112:18 178.20 federal 53:7 finished 43:9 feel 120:21 firm 4:13 139:25 felt 141:19.22 140-14 155-1 first 15:1,16 18:9

153:12 fence 16:10 23:10 26:9 41:17 43:23 54:25 55:2 fernan 1:13 fifth 41:23 58:12 70:4 72:23 fifty 174:17 80:7.15 82:19 83:5 figure 39:20 40:6 89:4 108:16,20 41:12 79:5 126:10 151-8 9 157-8 12 figures 90:6 93:13 171:9 179:11 181:11

file 12:1 55:10 71:8 fit 125.9 86:19 90:8 91:19 **fitting** 41:13 126:13,18 127:14 five 43:5 116:15,15 florida 44:1,7 45:8 128:11,14,16 129:6 47:7,9,10,17,19 135:17 136:1 16 17 49:21 50:7 focus 56:5 58:4 137:6,10,12,23 138:14 174:13 115:3 139:9 143:13 176:21 178:1.5 164-15 179:6,18

files 90:14 94:11 139:11 95.15 129.4 137.11 focusing 139:15 137:13.14.19 144:6 171:8 176:23 177:5,7 follow 131:5 followed 101:17 final 109:13,18 finally 23:12 following 61:14 financially 185:20 find 5:22 28:22 131:8.9 145:9 follows 4:4

35:14 82:11 101:18 footnote 139:21,22 107:2 111:12 forced 78:18 foregoing 185:10 foregone 8:23 114:18 115:1 116:22 120:21 forgetting 41:25 128:22 129:22 form 28:19 48:17 145:6.11 146:8 50:1,9 76:20 77:9 157:9 182:7 108:18 110:13

163:3 former 31:12 forth 10:23 155:24 185:13 forthright 183:12 forward 22:19 114:9 found 9:24 52:10 106:17 121:22 122:1 143:12 162:9 four 20:25 21:2 109:18 152:5 fourth 120:16 framework 9:5 franke 1:12 frequency 78:8 froehlich 1:12 front 57:18 170:6 frost 2:3 3:6 4:8 12 11:22 19:23 29:1 32:11,21 34:21 42:8 48-21 50-5 16 57-9 57:12 61:11,21,23 68:24 77:1,22 94:25 108:21 110:17 120:4 126:2 144:10

144-15 150-5 156:12,13 163:6 fulfilling 8:13 full 25:1,12 26:9 focused 35:3 99:19 41:18 115:4 120:22 131-3 157-8 12 165:2 179:11 fully 7:20 function 123:5 160:23 161:10 167-19 fund 1:4

> g 4:1 **gabe** 2:15 gagner 1:5

185.9 15

gains 98:10 99:3 113:24 120:2 125:1 gap 89:3 97:23 129:1,6,8,12,19,24 129:24 130:1.2.4.10 130:11,18,21,25 131:14 gaps 131:17,20,21 gary 154:23 general 8:3.5 9:1 14:17 50:21,23 53:16,20 104:14 124-21 127-1 152:14.17 177:24 178:2 183:8 generally 21:17 25:3.21 64:1.13 79:11 121:17 145:1 150:1 generate 150:24 geocoding 143:10 geographic 12:22 george 104:18,25 105:1,2 106:4,18 gerald 1:10 gerrymander 45:8 48:14.24 49:14.23 50.15 gerrymandering 75:7,9 76:12 getting 8:22 53:5 80:23 141:25 ghitza 78:20 ohitza's 141:15 gist 24:18 give 6:22 10:6 13:16 29:5 31:21 32:5 44:12 46:25 48:4 51-16 54-14 82-13 153:3 154:13 further 26:10 70:15 155:15 given 40:8 61:3 78:16,16,17 86:19 99:25 124:15 138:3 141:21 142:18

gives 111:19

glasses 98:3

180:22 goal 36:3,5 goes 130:2 172:4 going 16:2,5,6,13 17.5 19.18 19 21.18 26:22 30:18 31:22 32:4,5 53:9 54:22 57:13 66:20 22 67:4 67:11,14,19 70:15 82:13 87:19 113:14 126:19 127:16.18 128:4.20.20 129:1 129:10 156:9 159:21 160:2,5.6 161:20.24 169:15 169:17 170:1 13 171:6 174:4 177:18 177:19 180:24 good 23:8 30:12 35:16 58:4,11,18 114:5 131:7 140:18 140:22 162:12 gore 104:19 gotcha 94:12 141:5 gotten 53:12 137:3 governing 169:10 government 179:20 179.20 governor 34:2 108:11 146:24 153:12 great 57:3,8 60:7 62.23

greater 81:1 119:23

168:20 179:10

group 84:17 90:20

92:11,12 127:24

133:14,17,22

green 40:12

grew 168:2

ground 4:18

135:4 167:21 168:3

91:11,15,15,23 94:1 116:20 122:9 123:21 124:4 125-23 126-1 133:23 134:21 135:3,7 136:6 173-17 182-13 grow 124:8 growing 37:1,2 167:18 gubernatorial 33:23 39:16 112:21 115:6 119:5 guess 56:14,17 58:13 97:6 118:18 179:14 h h 3:10 11:16 34:20 haas 1:13 half 71:23 174:19 174.20 hand 19:18 39:24 handed 20:1 170:21 handing 32:2 42:2 68:18 handled 177:18.21 177:22.25 happen 7:5 36:14 103:19 happened 108:15 119:15 happening 101:10 113:19 happens 7:10 88:24 150:6 172:5 177:6 happy 126:11 hard 5:11 15:16 18:3 19:14 35:25 52:5 101:6 106:25 112:1.2 harder 30:11

harm 46:20 harmed 167:11 harold 1:11 harping 86:4 heading 70:5 71:20 hear 68:5 heard 65:10 69:21 hearing 22:14 heavily 78:5.10.14 153:9 183:14 held 1:21 51:1 help 6:21 42:18 helpful 102:2 113:9 hereinbefore 185:13 heterogeneous 70:8 high 14:3 15:10,11 29:13 35:2 37:1 60:4 64:7 65:1.4.21 66:1.7.17.19 67:13 68:2 70:11 72:9 98:6,8,11 99:3 101.5 118.8 119.7 119:17 120:10 145:8,11 148:6 166:22 167:8 higher 10:11 13:23 14.8 29.9 63.23 67:11 73:20 86:7 90:1 92:17 99:13.15 99:17 100:10 102:12 119:2 124:24 131:25 133-25 134-12 14 134:16 146:5.6 147:25 149:6,11 156:18,19 162:22 166:4 172:16 173:4 173.7 13 178.4 179:13,15 182:23 183:2 highest 17:15.16

53.14 hispanic 81:15 82:20 83:7,12,24 88:7.13 89:22 97:8 97:13 122:13.21.23 123:2,4,11,24 124:18 165:14 hispanics 97:3 114-23 123-13 18 165:11 168:7,20 historical 169:12 historically 149:5 168:7,20 history 17:17 81:2 157:16,23,25 158:17 159:17.22 161-23 162-4 9 168:25 169:9 hit 15:14 16:8.8 hold 82:12 87:19 hole 32:6 homeless 43:7 53:2 hours 7:8 56:9 15 house 43:25 44:6.23 45:1 huge 18:13 111:8,10 152:18 husted 11:13.15 43:7 45:14,22,24 46:1 50:19 53:3,18 hypotheses 118:25 hypothesis 144:18 145:6 hypothetical 35:9 36:4,14 134:13 145:14 idea 8:3.5 10:25 17:24 40:14.16 63:18 162:13.17 163:5 ideal 17:22 111:2

ideally 33:10

172:17 176:2

identical 60:14 84:2

identification 19:22

32:10 42:7 68:23

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

115:22

highly 59:23 107:19

119:24 146:15

159:18 160:3

hired 43:24 45:14

47:7 50:19 51:2

[identification - iohnny] 162:15,16 169:21

identified 34:7.11

63:14 83:23

180:23

impute 153:22 inaccurate 126:19 126:21

identify 16:13 35:18 87-9 94-13 95-1 27.5 140.17 23 24 incentives 25:13,24 idiosyncrasies 61:2 ids 162:22 incidentally 157:5 ignoring 113:19 include 8:20 27:9,13 imagine 17:20 56:24 91:11 92:4.8 121:8,8 150:12 immediately 145:9 156:16 included 121:4 157:25

impact 15:18 16:4.6 16:7 51:23 55:24 60:10 66:23 80:9,11 80:22 81:6 107:10 123:23 124:23 125:21 133:1,3 148:8 149:3 155:18 156:8.23 157:2 158-6 13 159-20

160:2 166:15 167:1 180:8 impacted 55:21 65:2,22 66:2 101:24 102:6 130:5 impacts 159:2 impermissible 45:7 48:13 49:23 50:14 impermissibly

implemented 58:16 138:20 implementing 57:1 implicitly 130:10 152:11 153:4 179:14 implied 154:25

implies 180:5 imply 142:21 important 58:13 59:16 70:24 113:13 132:10 141:19 157:22

imprecision 17:6 impressive 124:20 imputation 143:23 incentive 26:24 27:1 26:4,12,18 27:18,22

indicates 24:12 indication 146:24 indifferent 15:8,15 indirect 33:17 individual 12:4,12 12:16 16:24 33:11 33-13 71-10 76-3 7 76:11 77:4,11,16,20 including 121:1 78:3,19 81:25 82:1 90:19 107:3 115:13 155:19 160:4 income 13:14.22.23 115:14.23 116:9.17 13:24 14:3.5.8.9 117:5 122:4 149:21 15:10 29:9 63:23 150:2,4 152:20,23 153:22.25 154:24

74:17 155:20,23 156:7.19 155:2 158:20 increase 9:9 10:3,24 individual's 83:21 19:5 28:15 38:22,23 individualized 12:11 14 16:21 71:6 87.5 9 99.13 105.15 105:19.24 107:5.12 82:6 116:5 158:5 107:14 111:22 individuals 13:23 17:3 70:23 78:8 113:3 116:24 119:1 123:13 124:3,6,20 130:9 146:9.22 industry 101:2

162:25 166:5,7,8 182.6 ncreased 19:2 89:3 102:24 103:10,21 103:23 104:10 105:8.22 106:2 117:23,24 164:20 164:23 166:10,11 167:8 171:17 184:5

147:3 148:10

increases 81:17 97:21 106:13 informed 8:21 insight 111:19,21 130:25 145:16 146:18 165:18 instances 95:10 increasing 28:7 30:6 institute 1:3 116:25 118:23 intended 72:17 165:24 increasingly 14:3,4

independent 38:4,8 intention 29:25 indicate 64:13 interest 18:15 121:16 142:10,23 interested 75:20 indicated 40:5 150:15 157:2,9 80:25 121:21 185:20

interesting 72:19 interests 28:13 30:1 169:3 international 21:6 interpretations

168:11 interval 58:16 152:5 intervention 19:2 75:11 introduced 108:25 invalid 153:22 invisible 136:25 involve 34:1 106:14

involved 41:5 54:2 involvement 46:57 involves 56:20 136:23

involving 60:2 108:23 146:14 irregardless 16:3,6 16:14 irrelevant 101:23 isolate 119:6 isolation 181:17,18 issue 30:21 44:2 47-21 73-9 113-10 166:16 167:2

ssues 46:6 56:5 75:3 121:23 139:16 139:18 141:19 143:14 italicized 157:10

i 1:12 iennifer 1:5 jersey 1:23 185:4 **job** 140:18 john 1:12 45:22,24 53:18 104:24 johnny 1:6

intent 30:15.22 31:1 31:13 33:5 49:3,7,9 49:18,20 Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company

inference 153:15,17

154:5.10

153:25

160:13

inferences 78:2

inflated 134:2

influence 36:15

information 12:19

29:5 54:2 138:1,8

141:9,21 142:25

154-24 155-19

[johnson - literature]

28:18 48:16 49:25 50:8 57:5 76:19 77:8 108:17 110:12 113:23 120:1 124:25 156:9 163:2 184:17

johnsonkarpg 2:20 journal 3:13 19:21 20:3.5.11.16.21 69:8,14

judge 1:10,10,11,11 1.12.12 jumping 33:12 jurisdiction 177:18 justice 2:14

k karp 2:15 28:18 48:16 49:25 50:8 57:5 76:19 77:8 108:17 110:12 113:23 120:1 124:25 156:9 163:2 184-17

kawski 55:13 keep 88:19 keeping 128:2 133:19 ken 58:14 170:7,24 kennedy 1:13 kenosha 40:15 kerry 104:24 kevin 1:12

key 31:8 63:24 kind 7:14 12:17.22 13:12 16:8 18:20 51:9 52:6 60:8,23 63:18 19 64:12 67:8 68:9 80:17 101:1 125:4,25 128:4,18 128:25 132:20 134:22 143:18

155:17 158:17 161:1,8,11 173:10 183:11,12 184:11 king 154:23

knew 180:15 know 4:16.5:10.8:16 10:2,13,19 16:10 17:4,13,13,13,15 18:6 9 10 18 24 25 19:10 22:25 24:7,8 31:20 34:6,10,14 37:3,6,7,10,10,19 37:23 38:1,2,5,6,9 38:10 13 19 22 23 39:4,17,18 40:21 53:8,13 54:21 59:1

60:24 61:24 62:2 63:2 66:25 67:1 68:7,8 71:15 73:14 73:17,19 75:20 79:22 80:10 87:20 93:6 101:7,12,17 103:19,25 106:19 106:21.22 107:1 109:20 111:14 112:1,2,2 114:9,15 114:18 115:1,17 116:13 20 23 117:13,16,25 118:2 118:4,4,6,7,9 119:20 120:3 123:4 124:1.2.13.14.16 125:6.9 127:13 128:12 132:5,8,14 132:14 134:18,19 134-20 135-15 19 135:21 136:7,8 138:2,16,19,21 140:15 141:10.18 145:14 146:1 148:23 149:9 154:16 155:14.15 155-17 156-3 23 158:11,12,25 159:4 159:5 160:8 162:20

166:19 167:18

169:1,7 173:4,8,9

173:21,23 176:13

176:19 177:16.20

180:12,15 181:6,17

knowledge 23:4 lead 109:8,18 143:8 known 16:16 24:8 league 47:6 learn 105:7 leave 127:7 1:24 34:20 185:2 left 39:24 134:24 136:5 176:9,11 labels 83:13 legal 100:1 156:10 lack 125:9,10 legislature 27:10 lamelas 1:11 legislatures 30:10 language 124:16 letter 24:2,18 letters 94:23 large 15:4 39:24 letting 43:16 level 55:18 74:18 40.3 8 98.10 99.3 111:22 113:1 131:2 78:19 79:12 80:17 98:7 115:13,23 larger 92:11,12 97:22 105:18,23 122:4 132:4 146:2 109:19 130:20 149:21 150:17 152:20,24 153:22 largest 40:9 120:15 172.1 183.7 120:16 133:12 levels 77:21 155:19 167:8 latent 70:11,12 leverage 154:24 law 4:13 13:7 18:24 license 162:12 lichtmann 34:19

1

185.24

lag 161:9

157:9

166:9.13

late 55:3

April 14, 2016

Page 13

19:15 30:10 51:8 55:20 57:1 71:25 35:3 73-1 9 21 75-2 6 lichtmann's 77:5 80:8,13 93:2 life 5:5 liked 7:8 158:24 159:2 laws 11:9 20:4.7 likelihood 158:14 25:3,7,21 27:11 limited 72:12:18 29:24 30:3,21,25 line 10:13 23:12 31:2 33:22 36:12 25:4 26:9 33:9,13 52:17 60:11 62:9 33:19 41:6.7.12.17 73-25 74-20 76-15 71:23 72:24 76:18,23,24 79:18 linear 41:13 80:2 100:15 101:14 101:24 102:6 110:9 111:15 123:23 124:22 144:19,23 145:7.10.15 158:7 158:13 166:16

167:2.16.16.25

169:10 184:2

lawsuit 100:16

lay 158:10

linearities 70:19,20 linking 115:13 list 35:13 50:18 138:7,9,10,15,23 180:9,16,24 181:4 listed 84:21 listening 175:6

literature 7:24 35:18 65:8.25

April 14, 2016

Page 15

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

(866) 448-DEPO

April 14, 2016 Page 14

[litigation - mean]

litigation 170:8 25 looked 33:22 34:23 182:22 183:1 63:6,8 78:23 110:21 little 21:12 57:23 110:23 129:25 61:6 62:18 70:15 148:24 152:23 71:24 72:25 73:7 74:6 91:9 94:16 178:14 looking 9:24 10:17 101:24 144:13 155:5 176:22 45:12 13 60:25 178:21 live 29:14 78:9 118.3 load 162:5 113:16 119:13 local 27:13 125:10 125:11 152:13 locations 125:3 136:24 152:1 15

logic 153:21 logical 78:1 logically 52:18 153:21 long 13:13 74:16 140:2 142:7 162:11 171:25

longer 90:15 136:17 162:16 look 13:21 14:1 19:25 23:10 25:10 32:23 34:24,25 35:23 39:19 75:11 75:13 78:12 80:16 81:5 87:12 89:4 91:2 95:25 97:20 102:19 20 104:5 112:14.17.18.22.24 113:13 114:15,16 115:23 116:16 122:15.16 126:3 127:13,14,15,16,16 129:4,5 130:2 135:10 16 16 139:20,20 147:15

152:4 154:18 157:7

173:21 181:8 182:1

159:8.12.14 163:7

163:16 164:14

165:11 171:9

132:6 146:1 148:22 12:21 39:20 43:3 71:20 74:16 75:19 77:2,3,5 79:7,8 80:5 91:10 112:11 113:7

135:15 147:18,20 147:22 150:17 159:2 163:13 181:10 182:2,20 looks 43:20 122:20 159:15 lost 44:24 lot 10:8 36:14 66:10

66:11 107:15 108:15 115:10 125:20,24 131:2 163:16 183:15 lots 14:23 58:21 59:18 110:14 114:1 122:9.9 123:3 125:13 17 17 24 130:13,13 147:7 152:6,11 156:25 low 15:11 60:6 64:6

64:8,16,23,24 65:1 65:21 66:1,7,16,19 66:21 67:9,15 68:1 70:12 72:9 118:8.10 118:11.15.17.20.21 118:22 119:3,7,17 119:21 123:2,18,18 123:18 19 19 124:19 125:14,14 wer 13:24 14:5,9 39:24 62:17.18.21 78:8 80:18 92:15 100:20.20 156:18

156:19 159:25

lunch 144:11 m m 1:4.6.7 34:20

167:15 181:24 24

macro 80:17 madison 2:18 40:11 magnitude 18:5 70:22 75:14 114:21 main 2:16 105:21 106:2 135:1.2 150:20 maintained 138.9 maintenance 138:7 138:10,23 180:9,16

major 19:6 making 99:1 142:20 155:1 175:24 management 180:24 181:4 manipulate 25:14 25:25 26:4.13.19.24 27:5,20 28:3 35:10 manipulated 28:12 manipulating 29:25 manipulation 36:4

manner 56:25 manuscript 24:10 map 44:19 48:13 49:14.22 maps 44:5,20 45:7 47:15 48:11.15.20 48:23 49:3.5.18 margin 18:20 66:21

67:8.18.21.23 68:6 68:17 109:8,19,25 marginal 15:7,12 16:9 18:1.4.22 67:9 67:14 68:14,15 109:14,17 mark 1:13 19:20

32:3 69:21 169:18 marked 19:22 32:10 32:13 42:3.6.10 57:16 68:19,23 70:1 82:10 96:1 102:21 126:5 169:21 170:22

(866) 448-DEPO

martin 1:24 185:2 185:24 massive 108:22 match 86:21.23 140:24 atched 143:16 matching 140:18

math 82:12 98:2 matter 4:15 9:2 11:5 14:17 16:12 19:6 20:8 70:21 121:2 124-21 125-4 135-8 165:10 175:25 177:24 178:2 matters 134:17 158:21 183:8

mayer 71:8 78:21 81:9 82:1 83:18 84:3 90:9 94:19 95:8 112:13 129:10 170:7,24 171:11,16 171:23 mayer's 56:6 58:14

126:13 139:8 143:24 157:15 179:17 181:9 mccarty 1:21 3:3,13 3-14 15 17 21 4-2 9 4:10 19:20,21,24 32:4,9 42:3,5 57:13 57:17 68:19 21

126:5 144:16 169:18,20,23 170:20.22 171:15 185:6 nccarty's 3:15 42:6 170:14 mean 9:13,14 14:7

16:23 22:23 27:21 27:23 28:20 31:3 35:8,21 36:3,3 37:14 40:20 21 24 56:19 58:7 59:10 60:14 62:23 64:12 64:23 65:5.14.16.18 67:19,22 77:24

91:13 94:8.17 107:18 111:2,16,21 Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company

[mean - numbers]

112-17 113-16

120:11 124:5

140:17 142:1

160:10 161:1

180:11 183:11

meaning 96:20

166:24,25

137:13 138:12

115:10,18 116:10

144:20 151:21,21

155:6,13 159:23

168:10 11 179:8

meaningful 166:15

means 60:18 61:17 85:23 91:24 107:1

127:8.9 148:15

163:21 173:4.6

measurable 30:5

measurably 9:8

measured 89:19

measurement

measure 9:16 76:22

measures 159:16,17

mechanical 125:4

medication 7:13

memorized 63:7

mentioned 99:23

154-16 156-6

method 170:15

methodological

171:24

75:3

51:4

139:12,12 141:15

methodology 35:19

michael 1:6,13 51:3

methods 171:16

members 27:9

memory 6:23

mention 99:20

113:20.22

10.3

76:23

121.23

meant 30:11 33:14

58:9 65:13.13 82:23

83:10 84:22 142:21

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

mid 18:8 58:22 23 62:12,15 63:4,12,16 177:8 63:17,21,25 64:17 103:18 128:10 middle 6:16 31:25

68:3,4 147:21 mike 53:21 million 116:15 milwaukee 40:10 mind 43:15 minorities 52:3

182:23 183:3.10.10 minority 11:20 51:24 52:16 54:10 165:25 172:5.16.18 173:5,6,7,14 183:15 183-17

minus 84:18 minute 163:10 minutes 4:17.7:7 170:3,11 misheard 79:14 misleading 157:14

158:6 missed 41:9 missing 135:25 misspoke 32:22 mobile 178:8 mobility 124:17,24

178-33 mobilization 10:23 mobilizes 145:3 mobilizing 113:6 model 17:1,4,5 38:17 130:25 141:11,14 143:18 143:19 158:22 models 16:16,18 126:15 139:9,18

159:7,7 modest 148.8 moment 74:7 91:21 monetary 140:17 money 108:2 112:20 morning 67:25 motivated 107:21

mouth 15:23 85:19 move 125:18,23 moved 44:21 118:16 125:12 181:3 moving 50:17 multiple 160:23 municipal 78:24,24 79:12 93:21 146:2 municipalities

40:10 41:6,8 78:6 78:10 13 15 110:23 111:10,12 146:10 nunicipality 12:23 40:8 132:8 133:14 mystery 114:24 n

n 2:1 3:1.1 4:1 34:20 34:20 naacp 45:14 name 3:12 4:12 53:1 names 136:24 narrow 99:23 109:8 nation 169:8 national 13:15 74:18 178:12 nationally 31:7 nature 119:24 near 120:20,22

necessarily 30:16

36:6 60:16.18 61:16 78:6 129:2 180:12 181-21 necessary 143:10 need 4:25 6:14 15:9 40:19 86:23 88:16 112:7,7 135:21 136:7,8 175:4 needed 86:18 88:17 90:13 139:17

negative 51:23 neither 68:1 185:16 185:18 nelson 1:5 neutral 20:8 169:10

never 16:13 49:7 122:21 new 1:23 38:19 39:10.18 110:9 118:1.10.16 124:17 125:8,13 177:9 185:4 nichol 1:10 nine 116:23.24 123:17 139:21 nj 1:25 noise 122-9 nolan 1:20 3:3.15 4:2 42:5 185:5 non 67:11 90:15 92:17.19 121:8 128-1 132-20 23 134:21 135:3.7

133:14,24 134:1,14 136:13 173:2,6.17 174:3,20 175:7,9,10 178:24 179:9,13 180:6 14 25 182:11 182:13 183:10.11 nonlinearities 70:17 70:21 normal 5:12 northeast 43:6 53:2 notary 1:25 185:2 noted 98:14 139:17

**noting** 185:8 notion 144:20 november 13:20 55.3 nuance 184:11 number 23:2 39:18 40:7 41:15 42:24 43:11.12.13.14.14 51.7 85.5 93.8 97:13 104:2,6 105:17,24 131:10 131-12 133-25 162:21 185:24 numbers 84:21

86:13 24 91:9 92:14

102:23 113:17

119:23 122:19

168:17 182:2

[nuts - part] nuts 178:22

nw 2:4

o 4·1

nutshell 51:21

0

object 28:18 48:16

49:25 50:8 76:19

113:23 120:1

124:25 156:10

163:2

181:13

77:8 108:17 110:12

observable 67:20,20

observation 97:6

observations 90:20

observe 9:15 104:9

153:20 174:11

observed 89:24

129:7 131:21

146:18 174:10

obtained 59:13

137:15,24,24

obtaining 11:25

obvious 25:2,19

27:24 36:7 obviously 26:22

27:24 31:3 56:19

82:19 132:17 139:4

22:6

167:4

occasions

49.12

odds 166:18

offended 5:11

offer 30:19 46:15

offered 23:21 24:6

46:17 51:23 54:7

offering 52:14 73:8 123:22,25 183:23

office 27:8 28:7

official 1:14 86:23

officially 138:19

officials 27:14.16

obtain 22:4.5 93:19

140:10 142:11.24

offs 139:1 182:12 149:5 154:13 161:3 72:1 73:2 80:5.11 oftentimes 24:2 163:7 11 164:6 170:4.9 171:20.21 118:13 7:8 21:14 24:15 171:22 172:13 36:17 52:13 79:10 175:5 18 176:23 83:5 89:11 91:20 178:2,13 179:8 133:21 104:19 140:6 178:6 180:20 181:8 182:16,19 183:5,22 179:8,12 180:21 127:12 ohio 11:12 12:1,1 184:9 older 29:21 13:1 43:8 45:16 18 129.3 omitted 150:24

45:21,22 46:8 50:19 50:22,24 51:8 52:3 one's 8:14 ones 38:15 118:10 53:7 136:21 okay 4:9,19,20 5:1,2 open 156:23 157:3 operated 140:2 5:6,7,13,14,20,21 6:3,4,8,9,18,19,23 142:7 6:25 7:3.4.11.12.23 opinion 29:22 30:19 12:13,25 14:12 30:24 46:15 48:22 19:24 21:14,19,21 49:13 51:21,22 21:25 22:21 23:10 52:14 54:4,6 73:8 23:16 24:22 27:9 123:22.25 183:24

28:11 29:2 31:23

32:1 33:9,16,21

39.5 12 14 17 19

40:5,12,15 41:9,19

41:20 42:14 43:15

43:17,20 57:10,21

57:25 58:1,10,18

62:22 64:22 65:12

65:19 66:6 68:5,12

71.11 16 18 72.4 17

74:19 79:10 81:22

82:8,14 83:2,5,9,15

84:1 85:3.11 86:3.8

86:11.25 87:8,12,18

87:22 88:19 89:4,11

90:10 91:22 92:3,13

97:15 98:10 99:20

100:7,12,12 102:4

103:19 104:5 108:9

109:12 110:2 115:7

117:23 126:9,11

127:13 128:6,9

131:23 142:16

147:12 148:19

129:20 131:5.7.19

94:2 95:19 96:7

68:18 69:19,25

opinions 52:11 108:14 opportunity 8:24 opposed 30:8 97:3 opposite 66:14 opposition 31:6 optimism 60:2 option 151:9 oral 1:20

order 9:17 18:10 43:21 135:21 136:5 137:25 143:10 150:23 ordered 44:20 outcome 8:8,9,10

19:7,17 30:6 48:8 109:13,22 150:14 outcomes 35:11 59.8 11 61.4 75.11 75:13,20 76:12 150:22 151:3 outline 21:23

outside 12:25 22:5 22:11 23:8 74:24 76:1 overall 11:20 17:16 50:3 63:20 66:16,20

87:5 90:16 100:10 100:20 102:6.24 103:9 105:8 168:16 overestimate 133:17 overrepresented oversample 127:12

p 2:1,1 4:1 **p.m.** 184:21 2:17 p.o. package 55:19 page 3:4,12 4:19 23:11 24:22 25:11 26:7.10 32:19.23.24 33:2 39:19 41:18 43-4 4 45-13 57-21 58:3 62:5 69:25 71:18,22 72:2,25 79-3 4 6 81-23 82-8 82:9,14 91:3 95:25 102:20 117:18 120:21 22 126:4 133:8 139:20,21 147:17,18 157:7 163:12 171:7 179:12 181:10 pages 170:2 panic 85:22 22:25 23:5 paper papers 23:2 paragraph 25:1,12 25:18 26:9 41:18 70:16 120:22 147:19,21,21 157:8

157:13 158:17

171:10 179:11.11

39:24 71:12 94:10

Page 18

144-4 5 7 145-24

181:11 182:4.20

oarsing 172:24

part 25:23 31:8

147:5 151:8

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

[participate - population]

participate 14:9 28-24 25 55-6 80-4 participated 173:25 participating 8:16 participation 9:3,19 10:1,15 11:10 13:4 13:6,10 19:13 55:23 123:5 126:1 particular 9:7,10,25 11:3,4,8 12:18 13:3 13.7 15.17 19.2 15 24:9 25:22 27:1 35:24 56:5 76:14 80:9 90:22 119:5,10 134:22 147:9.13 148:9 154:12 156:1 161:13 particularly 107:9 171.8 parties 185:17 partisan 25:2,7,19 28-3 13 15 30-1 22 179.7 30:25 31:3,4,19 33:5,7,17,22 35:15 35:17,20 36:1 45:7 47:16 48:23 49:3,6 49:8.14.18.19 55:24 59:25 115:11,11,12 partisans 25:13,25 26:3 12 18 23 27:5 27:19 28:22,23,25 36:6 partisanship 26:21 33:11 78:19 79:9 115:14,25 143:1 152:24 parts 114:14 132:4 party 11:12 28:21 30:4,7,8 31:7 36:11 37:17,18 50:19 60:3 60:4 75:22 140:3 142:8,14 152:13 passed 29:24 30:21 106:3 110:1,7 30:25 31:2 167:25 122:23 123:4.12 patrick 1:13 136:9.10 163:22.23

pattern 5:13 179:25 patterns 5:12 90:22 perfect 21:20 39:8 peer 22:5,11 23:9 perfectly 5:16 performed 98:20 pending 53:6 people 12:21 14:25 period 11:17 46:8 15:3,14,21 16:9,13 46:10.12 17:21 18:10,15,19 perkins 2:3 4:13 34:6,10 36:18 39:1 perkinscoie.com 2:7 63:19 67:17,21,22 permitted 27:2 person 16:2 19:11 68-3 6 91-18 108-24 110:6 111:14 118:3 36:21 68:15 90:21 118:5,15 120:6 107:22 142:17 125-11 18 127-2 3 5 168-15 181-3 perspective 184:10 127:6,11,15,17 128:13,15,16,17,21 **ph.d.** 1:21 3:3 4:2 129:5,18 131:4,15 185:6 134:23 135:19 phrase 179:9 136:1,2,2,4,7,16,25 phrases 5:23 138:13 144:12 pick 181:5 picked 65:7 159:21 piece 116:17 159.8 12 162.14 18 162:22,25 176:6,14 pieces 54:1 176:16,23 177:4 pinpoint 18:3 place 15:1 93:2 people's 7:25 99:23 100:1,6 percent 18:19 85:5 101:14 135:2 85:6,9,25 86:6,7,8 150:25 185:12 places 123:3 152:15 86:14 87:1.5.15.23 88:7 89:6.9 97:9 plaintiff's 48:3 109:18 116:23,25 49:10 plaintiffs 1:8 2:8 117:19,21 122:21 122-24 123-7 15 15 4.14 54.8 56.4 127:25 129:7 164:6 72:14 115:2,18 164:8 165:2,4 134:6 137:15 139:5 174:10.11.12.15.17 140:12 172:10 174:17.23 179:21 plausible 105:13 plays 26:21 179:24 180:4,5 percentage 12:21 please 5:3,10,18 17:8,25 84:7,21,23 6:15 21:25 24:23 85.1 7 86.9 88.4 11 26:8 39:6 57:22 69:19,25 70:4 88:14 89:2,15,19 96:12,22,25 97:17 147:17 163:12 102:25 103:11 171.7 178.20 180:22,22 104:8,11 105:8 plot 39:21 40:1,13

18:7 59:7 62:24 86:10 88:7 89:2.20.23 95:18 96:25 99:6 123:12 128-24 130-7 140-8 140:25 142:6.9 151:23.24 154:19 162:6 164:11 165:6 165:13 pointed 81:10 points 19:6 22:15 84:23 85:7 88:4,14 89:15 96:12 22 97:18 102:25 103:11 104:8,11 105:9 106:3 110:1.7 150:16.22 151:4.12 151:15,20 163:22 165:18 poke 32:6 polarization 112:15 polarizing 106:5,14 106:18,25 107:3,9 107:19 108:12 111:7 119:24 146:15 policies 10:16,18 policy 76:9 political 7:24 16:15 20:11,17,21 21:4,7 26:11.17 27:4.19 28-3 29-23 35-22 37:14 63:14 69:8,14 70:9 106:5 149:17 154:8 politicians 31:11.12 35:10 politics 21:5,6,10 63:20 polling 152:15 153:14 polls 8:23 10:12 109:7 17 23 populate 151:25

April 14, 2016

Page 17

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

40:18.24

plus 85:12

61:12,15 134:8

170:3,11

83:6

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016

[population - purpose] 118-20 119-1 present 116:18.19 121:21 122:7 presentational 124:18 152:13 139:15 presenting 113:12 166:3.3 173:21 populations 91:12 presents 82:24 93:24 146:19 152:1 president 104:14 position 45:18 50:24 presidential 17:14 18:7,12,17 58:22 positive 149:2 160:9 62:16:63:4.13.16.21 possibilities 73:23 64:1,16 102:10,10 possibility 93:11 103:17,21,23 110.19 145.22 105:10.16.25 107:6 possible 14:17,22 148:25 49:5,17 99:18 pressed 19:14 107:23 108:4 presumably 10:10 27:7 38:14.15.25 124.9 140.9 142.11 40:10 65:24 143:17 146:17,21,22,25 presume 167:24 pretty 35:16 56:16 56:18.18 61:4 63:1 176:24

168-11 possibly 79:19 114:11 115:5 157.14 post 29:13 76:25 77:18 101:19 potential 8:7 115:12 potentially 110:8 113:15 146:6 powerful 26:12,18 practice 101:17 pre 76:25 77:18 101:19 precinct 12:23 precise 6:1.6 45:6

preventing 125:8 previous 11:6 12:6 81:1 128:25 139:3 158:10,16 159:16 159:16,17,22 pride 165:10 primary 18:15 princeton 1:23 principal 10:19 principle 26:6 80:12 125:22 142:3 154:7 principles 15:17 precisely 65:2,22 83:7 precision 132:12,13 predict 12:4 prior 21:21 100:2 126:16 129:10 predicting 16:18 prediction 180:18 priority 31:8 35:13 predictions 17:2 115:22 predictor 99:25 probability 8:9 preexisting 168:23 83-22 probably 17:21 prefer 182:17 prepared 57:15 63:22 66:13 105:18 82:9 147:16 170:24 107-15 122-18 preparing 56:12,13 143:22 148:17 presence 49:20 152:17 177:3 178:12 181:2 Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company

problem 48:10 126:17,23 138:24 139:14 149:22 153:16.18 154:10 155:8,10,12 176:17 problems 86:21 122:17,18 137:17 144:1 153:19 154-12 171-12 procedure 30:16 55:21 76:22 83:19 90.18 133.16 procedures 9:8,8,17 10:3 12:3 51:11 53:24 54:2 58:15 75:10 154:22 process 11:18 21:24 22:16 125:16 138:7 processes 76.9

produce 180:1 produced 24:19 professionalized 27:17 professor 4:9,10 19:24 56:6 57:13 71:8 78:20.21 81:9 82-1 83-18 84-3 88:18 90:9 94:19 112:13 121:25 126:13 129:9 143:24 144:16 157:15 167:7 169:23 170:7 20 24 171:11.14.15.23 179:16 181:8 profile 101:5 148:6 profit 139:25 140:14,16,23,24 profiting 141:1,2

propensities 70:11 propensity 15:11,11 64:6.7.8.16.23.24 65:1,2,4,21,21 66:1 66:1,7,7,17,19,21 67:2,5,12,15 68:1,2 72:9,9 118:8,8,10 118:11.15.17.21.22 119:3,7,17,17,21 123:14 166:4 proper 115:16 proportion 84:17,18 117:17 proportional 167:21 proportionally 168:3 proportionately 40:7 114:18 166:6.7 proportions 117:16 proposed 95:18 154-23 proposition 9:4 27:24 proprietary 141:14 143:20 protests 108:23 prove 52:5,19 provide 115:20 provided 48:2 52:24 71:7 78:20 81:9 82:1 90:9 114:4 115:3 140:12 141:10 provisional 54:3 proxy 35:5 public 1:25 112:18 185.2 publication 21:22 publicly 31:13 publish 23:1 published 20:10,13 21:21 22:9 23:6 69:7.11 148:22 purpose 31:5 72:12 142:19

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016 Page 19

population 13:19

117:18,20,21

recommendation

17:9.25 18:22 93:10

93:19 104:4 117:13

[purposes - registered]

purposes 57:16 59:17 96:2 put 15:22 28:14 85:19 98:3 114:8

q qjps 21:19 23:13,17 quadrant 40:1 quantitative 52:7 quarterly 20:11,16 20:21 69:8.14 question 5:18 6:10 7:6 9:6.13 14:16 28:2 39:6 43:16 45:6 65:20 69:21 76:16 77:15 79:10 79:14,22,23,25 80:6 80:21,23 102:5 113:1 125:5 132:11 146:12 156:8,15,17 156:24 157:4 167:23 168:6.18

169:14 172:15 173:3,11 178:20 182:24 questioned 81:10 questions 4:21,23 4:25 5:4,15 7:15,20 13:20 54:22 57:4 69:20 115:10 131:6 132:14 156:21 159:6 170:2.13 184:14 quick 57:10

quickly 123:20 quite 35:22 61:10 75:4 122:8 131:1 166:21 182:9 quote 172:3,12

r 1:5,6 2:1 4:1 185:1 race 12:2,4 20:8 79:8.13 80:4 82:19 116:2.4.8.12 120:12 121:2,16 130:16 132-2 136-21 141:17.25 142:1 143:5,23 144:5

148-8 155-21 23 ratio 85:15.21 157:1 159:18,21 rationalize 147:10 reached 122:24 160:4,7,11,15 162:5 162:7 169:9 172:1 read 24:12.15.16 races 112:20 128:19 171:18 racial 80:9 82:15,25 reading 109:10,11 83:13 88:24 91:11 91-15 15 23 121-18 reads 25:24 26:10 122:9 127:23 128:5 real 36:13,18 77:15 128:5,23 129:1,6,8

164:11 165:6,18

129-12 19 24 24 realize 7:8 130:1,2,4,10,11,18 really 11:5 24:8 130:20,25 136:7,15 67:8 82:12 97:5 155:18.18 156:23 114:24 123:6 racially 80:22 81:6 128:19 130:23 rainy 10:9 131-1 134-17 135-6 raise 139:16 141:16 156:2 176:3 raised 56:5 reapportionment ran 104:13.17 75:7,9,18 reason 6:15 7:18 randle 1:6 range 18:1,4 105:21 106:1,2,10 rare 98:12 99:4 110:16 131:23 rate 17:18 119:2 132:23 134:7 121:24 122:2 167:10,12 168:13 125:14 130:6 132:2 178:23 183:14 132:21 133:15 easons 58:4,11,19 135-4 159-25 60.2 62.8 78.1 164:24,25 166:12 81:10 87:9 94:24 166:21 167:14 95:11 106:12 107:5

172-16 173-4 5 7 13

173:15 174:22

118-23 121-18

125:15 126:15

127:20,20,20

132:24 133:25

139:3 171:25

180:2 183:19

131-25 132-19 21

134:12,14,16 136:6

173:16 174:3.7.7.8

178:25 179:2,14,15

183.67

rebut 115:20 179:4 182:23 183:2 rebuttal 3:21 46:16 55:10 169:20 170:6 rates 9:3 10:1,15 170:23 181:9 11:10 13:4 14:20 recalculating 60:4,6 92:17 93:3 170:15 recall 24:21 99:13 98:11 99:4.9 116:11 99:21 100:2 11 17

125-13

101:4,13,15 109:10 109:10 149:2 167:6 recalled 109:3 recalling 54:24 recess 57:11 144:14 170:18 recognition 93:1 recollection 22:25 23:21,24 105:14

22:7,13 recontacted 55:8 record 5:17:11 32:20 80:23 110:25 126:19,21 144:13 149:23 170:10 records 176:1 recount 100:20 redid 48:11 redistricting 75:18 75.24 redraw 48:15,20 redrawn 50:4 reduce 10:4 160:6 reduced 46:11 reduction 46:15.19 reelection 109:25 refer 4:10 37:15.16 145.2 reference 175:24 referring 12:16,20 50:12 81:19 106:8 138:11 173:12,13 refers 77:25 181:18 reflect 23:23 124:10 146:11 reflected 178:1 reflecting 129:13 reflection 39.39 reflective 148:25 refrain 181:12 refrained 181:22 refresh 23:20 regard 92:24,25

regardless 17:10

register 92:21 125:3

86:14 87:15 24 88:3

88:8,23 92:1,5,9,16

104:1 116:16 136:3

175:13,14,19 176:6

138:14 174:15.18

120:12

125:14,20

registered 8:22

92:17,19,22,25

103:5,6,9,20,25

(866) 448-DEPO

94:18

95:22 180:10 16

progressive 140:3

prominent 17:14

promoted 30:4

programs 94:5

142:8.14

program

[registered - roll] 176:16.20 registrants 93:7.8

121:16 122:24

164.9 16 21 22

165:3,4,13,14

179:18 180:4

registration 10:16

91:18 93:3 123:2

124-22 125-7 16

176:21 177:1

regression 41:4

130:10 158:1

161:19,19,24

155:4

100:21

159:20 160:4.23

regressions 154:17

regressor 159:19 regular 100:20

regularly 37:4,8

reinvent 133:7

144:22 169:13

relates 182:11

relating 133:10

138:23 144:4,5,7

related 46:7 144:18

relation 68:14 173:9

relations 21:6 relationship 13:13

13:22 41:14 74:17

153-20 23 155-2

relationships 62:6

168:15.24 173:5.8

182:12 185:16,18

179-18 180-13

relatively 64:23

relevance 167:22

relevant 100:24

102:5 140:14 156:7

166:18,24,25 167:3

167:4 168:5,18,22

98.8

158:18 162:10

174:6

154:25

relative 64:21 132:19 135:6

157:17 158:1 164:7

restrictive 145:7

181:23,24

resulted 30:5

result 52:4 17 172:7

results 81:11 12 18

112:16 132:17

133:2,4 183:18

review 21:17 22:2

reviewing 22:21

reviews 22:5 12

23:9 170:16

revolve 115:10

revolved 46:6

right 6:11 7:11

22:14 52:18 54:18 56:22 62:19 72:5

73:11 75:23 81:24

82-2 20 86-1 87-25

91:5,20 97:2,11

103:11 107:15

108:16 110:1 2

131:11,17,17,20

144:16 154:3 155:6

163:18.19 165:20

116:3 122:22

141:25 143:6

170:20 176:18

rigorous 106:16

role 21:16 26:21

roll 86:22 90:22

126:23 127:4,21

129:23 131:24

132:2.5.19.21

133-11 15 134-12

134:23 135:4,5,6

139-1 7 171-25

136:6,9,10 138:24

172:16 173:1,5,7,13

173:14,16 174:3,7,7

174:8 176:23 177:4

179:1,9,13,15 180:6

177:7.11 178:5.25

rights 156:5

rise 9:2,25

roles 176:9

reviewed 22:11,16

retract 177:19

reveals 179:17

represent 4:14 40:4

170:5

179:6

epresentative

134-24 173-24

174:4,5 176:15

43:25 44:7,23 45:1

represented 170:23

represents 41:13

144-22 145-14

repressive 144:18

republican 28:13,15

29:20 31:7 34:2

28:16 29:3,4,6,8,19

35:1.6 36:19.21.23

45:24 48:13 49:23

51:4 59:14 63:23

146:23,24 152:25

republicans 34:8,12

37:5,9 44:8 47:11

required 50:4 53:25 54:1

requirements 25:21

reregister 125:14

177:9

145:18

reruns 60:9

research 118:19

reserve 153:20

residential 160:16

residents 125:8,13

respond 9:15.16

esponding 48:1

response 34:16,18

48-25 49-9 61-12

responsible 21:9

responsive 9:10

83-19 94-5 18 95-21

116:13 154:22

158-22

162:1

18:11 66:17

74:20 76:17 79:18

95:12 114:3

145:3

36:11

56:3 66:8

require 121:15

representatives

84.23 100.9 105.23

reliability 121:22

rely 18:25 143:14

remained 60:13

remedy 44:22

remember 6:22

50:2 104:13

renewed 51:9

report 3:14,21

30:20 31:17.21.25

32:10,17,19 33:4

41:10.10 44:10

46:22 47:24 48:1

49:1 51:13 54:11

55:11 56:6,12,13

57:15 58:14 62:6

71:13,19 82:9 87:13

90:12,19,25 91:3.25

94:3,13 95:2,3 96:1

102:20,21 113:21

119:21 120:14

132:15 138:25

139:8,21 141:15

169:21 170:7,24

179:1,3,17 181:9

41.5 117.18

185:3

reporter 4:23 5:5

11:14 19:19 32:3

reporting 182:5,6

reports 56:4 72:14

112:18 179:22

34.17 94.20 169.18

reported 34:15 35:2

147:16 157:8 163:7

121:22 126:4

113:22 114:9 117:7

98:5.13 99:21

38:24,24 39:20 40:5

repeat 39:5

renee 1:4

removed 138:13

22:21 31:24 42:18

remain 90:14 127:3

rem 44:22

[roll - slightly]

180:7,12,13,25

rolled 133:24

183:15 rolling 132:24

133:18 181:22

176:10,11,14

178-25

rolls 127:3 6 128:1

131:25 136:5 176:8

181-12 182-10 12

182:23 183:2.6.7.10

183:17,19 184:5,10

134:14,15 179:4

73:18 113:17 134-10 11 141-20 158:5 162:8 177:20 ays 25:13 33:10 70.7 17 72.19 78.20

87:21 140:5 147:22 157:13 168:24 171:23 scatter 39:21 40:1 40:13.18.24 schedule 55:4,4 scheduled 100:21

school 29:13

romo 43:23 47:22 science 7:24 20:12 49:12 20:17,21 21:4 35:22 room 124:6,8 69:9,14 rose 123:14 roughly 15:14 58:20 59:9,11 101:18 29:23

rpr 1:24 185:24 rule 50:14 125:22 rules 4:18 10:20 12:7 9 65:17 run 27:8 122:17 149:22 161:19

running 154:16 161:8,17,24 runs 71:22 rural 29:14 79:17 79:21

s 1:5 2:1 3:1.1.10 4:1 11:16 94:22 sample 86:17 127:11 128:15,15 128:22 129:18,22 130:1 3 18 20 131:3 131:10,16 134:23 174:5

samples 122:8 128:13 saw 78·4 85·21 98:16 99:12 146:23

saying 5:25 15:23 30:10 61:8 67:25

scientific 52:7 scientist 16:15 scientists 37:14 63:14 149:18 154:8 scope 33:2 1:6 34:4 59:14 102.16 scratch 31:20 162:23 181:6 seats 75:21 second 21:13 24:24 24:25 25:12.23 45:11 55:8 58:2,20 59:6 84:4 105:6 120:22 128:15 179:10 secretary 45:15,17 45:20.21 53:15.18 section 71:21,22 72:4.5.11 79:2.3 80:15,20 133:5,6 156:4 170:14 security 31:8 see 14:1 18:15 23:11 24:24 25:4,12 26:2 26:14 15 32:25 33:19 36:8 39:21 54:23 58:2,3 60:9 63:3 64:15 70:7.16

72:2 73:3,4 82:16

171.9 taken 9:21 100:1,5

154:2 185:11

talk 43:19 45:11

47:5 57:23 68:9,14

88:12 104:6 107:20

42:19

111:5 164:16

185:24

shelf 143:19

short 84:15

shorter 144:11

terminology 6:5 terms 10:23 59:4

63:4 68:10 89:2

111:5.5 123:12

test 6:13,24 33:15

33:16,21 35:16

testified 4:3 74:22

testify 44:14 47:2

testifying 52:22

text 164:14

184:15.16

21.7 25.9

48:6 51:18 54:16

testimony 3:3 46:17

thank 21:15 23:13

41:19 43:18 70:20

thanks 61:22 85:13

theoretical 9:4,21

theory 14:21,21,21

thing 36:7 65:13

114:23 161:15

166:18 183:13

things 10:15,16

48:25 143:5 185:11

tested 33:14

185.7

168:25

shares 41:15 60:12

sharon 1:24 185:2

43:2 81:12 112-19 22 113-18 109.7 114.16 128.8 143:25 163:25 121:10 130:16 132:6 133:5 135:17 171:17 135-19 136-14 showing 10:9 66:12 66:14,14 139:22,24 141:24 145:8,13,16 146:3,4 shown 65:25 105:5 105:21 106:1 148:1,24 152:24 157:19 159:9 shows 87:7 94:16 162:24 163:13 102:23 103:8.12 seen 144:21 147:9 165:12,23 169:23 170:25 sides 68:6 108:14 sell 141:2 3 4 161:17.18 signature 184:22 senate 47:9,10,15 48:10,12,19 49:16 185:22 59:2 147:23 148:8 significant 9:18 148:11 149:1,3,7,12 14:19 15:24 162:2 sense 5:25 17:7 65:9 93:5 silas 1:7 similar 11:16 12:8 sentence 25:11,23 47:21 49:15 52:11 26:14 15 31:24 33:1 58-21 59-4 9 12 58:3 70:16 134:7 142:21 147:22 171.9 10 13 172.13

April 14, 2016

Page 21

61:1,5 75:4,8 101:19 112:18 similarly 5:22 49:11 simple 125:9 175:11 181:11,20 182:19 sentences 70:4 separate 36:2 simply 6:16 31:6 49:16 74:3 80:15 serve 28:12 30:1 106:16 107:1 served 41:21 42:15 114:25 139:17 141:17 142:10 services 52:25 153:18 167:19 set 17:21 121:17 175:19 180:3

159:7 176:14 181:12,22 185:13 simulation 48:2 sets 41:14 single 175:16.17.20 setting 11:4 situation 114:8 situations 6:2 settled 47:4 seven 123:14,15,15 six 42:24 severely 90:17 sixth 120:15 share 36.9 59.13 size 18:22 28:8 9 16

> sized 40:7 skeptical 81:11 skewed 60:20,21 61:9,18,19,25,25 slight 148:15

41:5,8

slightly 89:3 90:1 143:3 156:20,21

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

April 14, 2016 Page 22

[slow - sure] slow 124-2

129:2,21

131-3

150:1

social 8:15

smidge 117:24

small 14:18,23,24 15:2,20 18:23 122:8 spent 56:7,9,11 108:2 112:20 134:1 148:18 149:2 spot 142:4 smaller 63:12 122:8 squeaker 59:21 snapshot 126:14

socially 29:15 software 94:15.17 stapled 32:7 sole 74:4 130:17 solid 41:12 51:24 started 43:8 98:6 solution 149:19 starts 79:4 solutions 154.9 somebody 15:7

107:2 143:9 omewhat 29:9.9 64:11 orry 25:16 27:21 32:22 45:5 50:11 48:19,23 49:16 65:5 78:23 83:5 89:10 91:20 94:14 103:6 104:19 128:8

180.21 sort 17:12 22:17 50:17 99:1 133:19 152:2 158:10 173:18 181:2 ound 23:7 sounds 22:15 23:17 56:21 154:3 sources 141:12

131:18 162:22

speaking 16:5 111:6 specific 13:6,16 23-3 3 40-25 67-5 74:20 144:21 178:16 specifically 37:13

38:13 46:9 99:8,11 statistic 76:8 137:21 161:7 statistical 12:3 171:15 178:10.11 16:16.18 17:1.5 183:20 19:1 38:17 49:10 specify 158:22 51-25 52-19 54-7 60:24 75:10 76:9

93.24

spend 4:17 171:3 spending 113:3 statistically 49:2

stability 160:16 stand 10:12,12 standard 35:22 101:2,17 105:15,18 105:24 start 72:23 155:18 starting 79:3 83:6 stata 94-18 22 95-2 95:7,8,9,13,15,22 state 2:13 10:14 19:14 27:10 31:17 44:1,7,21 45:15,15 45:17,20,21 46:8 47.9 10 15 48.9 12 50:13,21,24 53:16 53:18 90:8 108:24 121:24 177:9 181:4

185.3 state's 124:22 statement 14:13 70:13 25 98:18 99:2 109:21 148:4,19 157:15,19 172:2,11 172:19 181:16 statements 30:9 31:10,16 states 1:1 10:19 25:1 26:10,16 98:9 98-11 15 19 99-3 9 121:12,14 122:7,15 statewide 72:6

status 160:18 stay 127:5 stayed 176:7,10,14 stenographically 185:11 step 41:20 80:7 stepping 21:11 stipulate 124:1 stop 161:1 stories 147:7 strategy 58:14 112:12 street 2:4,16 strengthen 118:12 118-24 stresses 167:7 strictly 16:4 strike 147:19 181:7 stringency 25:3,6 25:20 strong 23:8 108:14 structures 152:14 studied 107:4 studies 9:24 10:9,14 11:6 19:1 66:12,14 70.9 105.4 20 106.1 106:7,20 122:7 study 13:19,21 83:18 106:23 156:18 studying 150:15 stuff 130:13 141:17 sub 94·10 subdivided 21:5 subfield 21:2,3,8 22-3 4 13 23-9 submission 22:1 94:10 submissions 23:1 submitted 94:11 95:16 170:7

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company

(866) 448-DEPO

subsamples 159:14 subsequent 55:24 substantial 15:18 17:21 24:6 62:19 124:3 133:1 146:8 substantively 70:23 subtract 24:4.11 subtracting 85:6 suburban 29:14 successful 5:17 sufficient 54:8 141.9 suggested 46:17 141:13 suggestion 155:6 156:1 suggestions 154:11 154:14 155:11 suggests 35:16 60:9 118:14 169:2 suite 1:23 2:4 1:22 summarize 55:14 summarizing 99:6 summary 71:24 super 175:4 support 29:3 140:3 142:7 146:24 suppose 78:4 101:13 147:8 155:16 174:9 174.9 10 10 11 19 supposed 92:20 181:5 suppress 31:14 110:9 suppressed 80:18 supreme 49:21 50:7 sure 4:18 22:23.24 30:15 36:17,17 41:25 42:21 43:17 48.18.61.7.10.64.5

65:12 66:13 72:22

73:6 85:17,20 90:5

108:1 167:17 168:1

178:6 181:19 182:9

95:5.5.16 107:11

170:12 177:14

[surge - timeline] surge 80:25 81:1 Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

April 14, 2016

Page 23

surged 80:24 surname 83:21 surprise 100:13 105:7.11 surprised 106:9 surprising 161:25 survey 121:21 surveys 121:20 svrs 172:6,18 179:18,22 swing 18:7 59:25

switch 19:11 switching 8:7 sworn 1:20 4:3 symbols 84:21

system 10:23 180:24 systematically 127:25

t 1:6 3:1.10 11:16 34:20 94:22.22 185:1,1 table 81:21 82:8 14 82:16 86:11,25 87:7 87:13,20 88:6,20 89:5.18 90:7 91:2.4 91:7,8,10,17,23

92:3 93:13.15 95:25 96:3 97:7 102:19 103:2,8,12 104:6 117:6 6 7 126:3 7 128:8 129:12 130:8 130:16,23 165:12 179:17.22 tables 116:19 120:5 122:20 163:13,16

163:17.25 174:24 179:16

take 6:17 19:25 39:19 41:20 42:22 47:5 57:6,9 87:12 128:9.12.13 129:4 129:17 143:24 144:11 151:1 170:3

72:20 74:6 81:20 82:18 87:20 88:21 149:15 155:3 163:9 176:22 talking 4:17 18:2,20 42:14 67:23,24 68:2 72:24 75:25 76:2.6 76:11.14 88:19 105:1,2 120:25 146:13 174:25 175:3.8.23 talks 7:24 targeted 145:15 task 60:9 tasse 1:5 techniques 160:23 tell 5:18 6:7,23 20:1 24.8 31.9 32.15 39:23 40:3 58:10 65:14 69:2 77:23 82:22 83:10 86:13 101:9 104:1 117:2.4 120:6 138:6 144:25 151:18 telling 112:3 tells 86:12 87:1 88:6 88:22

ten 98:16,20 125:19 127:2.4 134.3 178.8 tends 21:4 62:17 127:12 tens 108:23

tend 18:10:29:3:13 29:14,15,16,21 63:3 63:17 64:15 67:14 90:14 92:16 125:18 term 13:13 18:8 58:22,23 62:12,15

63:12.16.17.21.25

64:4.17.21 65:11

74:16 103:18

108:20 128:10

23:24 56:21 58:21 59:18 72:20 75:5 95:11 110:14 112-19 113-14 114:1,13 124:16,17 125:20,24 144:3 146:20 150:20 151:2.22.24 152:1.2 152:6,8,11 153:3 154:20 155:21,22 156:5,7,8,16,25 157:5 161:6 182:3 think 6:6,7,20 7:6 7:18 21:11 36:7 40:19 52:7 55:15 57:8 62:22 63:24 66:4,4,25 67:1,16 68:6 70:18 71:12 72:19 86:11 90:4 100:24 101:1.22

102:1,1,4 103:15

110:4 113:11 13 115:9,21 116:15 120:20 126:25 132:10.25 137:20 137:20,21 139:14 139:15 141:14 144:12 148:13,14 156:20 157:21 158-5 9 10 159-23 160:10 161:13 166:14,17,17,23,25 167-4 168-4 18 169:6 173:2.3 175:3 177:2 178:21 182:17 thinking 110:3 136:20 third 41:17 47:6 59:7 84:9

thomas 1:11 thought 11:1 23:4,6 30:18 39:8 50:11 69:21 79:10 110:6 143:21 thousands 108:23 threat 133:12 three 94:1 114:12 throwing 128:1 thursday 1:18 ticket 35:12 36:10 37:5,9 tied 19:10 time 6:14 16:23 25 20:24.25 22:10 42:22 44:8 45:22 47:11 51:2 52:6 53:17 55:4.10 56:7 56:11 61:14 100:16 102:11 109:23

112:8 115:8,16

152:16 154:19

170:16 171:3

timeline 55:7

143-8 21 150-16 23

151:4,12,15,20,24

[times - unpleasant]

times 8:10 41:21 true 14:3,11,14 42-15 19 134-8 36:25 50:6 77:10 160:11 79:20 83:24 109:21 timothy 1:12 111:16 114:17,23 title 20:5 91:25 122-13 127-1 titled 84:4,13 85:15 128:19 149:14 91:4 163:21 170:6 154:4 177:3,14 today 7:16,21 54:19 truncated 73:25 62:22 64:5 told 56:10 137:21 truthfully 7:21 trv 5:16,19 87:8 149:16 top 35:12,13,15 122:11 127:8,9 36:10 59:7 8 11 133:6 trying 80:1 85:18 84:10 98:15.19 tops 123:7 total 56:20 83:8 101:18 114:6,8,9,25 134:9 139:7 152:2 86:13 102:22 104:6 158:23 184:11 171:19 179:22,24 turn 17:15 24:22 26:7 28:23 36:6 totally 76:1 109:22 totals 72:6 113:8 44:18 57:14.21 61:4 touched 90:4 143:2 69:25 71:18 75:2 track 12:24 83:22 89:11 123:1,18,19 104:22 124:2 134:19,19 trademark 94.24 147:17 163:12 traditional 110:10 147:4 urned 60:3 86:15 traditionally 166:4 87:1,16,24 88:8,11 transcript 3:24 96:5,8,15 119:22 turnout 3:18 10:5 10:10 11:20 12:5 185:10 transition 5:11 13:5,10,20 14:19 166:21 transitioned 166:20 15-2 5 19 25 25 17:16,17 19:3,5,13 treated 177:11,11 treatment 65:3,11 30:6,8 31:6 38:23 65:15 66:5 70:10 55:22 58:7 59:22

62:7.15 63:3.11

66:16,20 67:9,13 68:22 69:5 71:2,5,9

71:21 72:1.14 73:2

73:10:20:74:3:4:10

74:12,14,19 75:2

78:5,13 79:5 80:5

80:17 18 24 81:13

81:14 82:15,25 84:7

84:11,17,18 85:1,4

85:24 86:5 87:5.10

88:3,12,23,25 89:5

89:8,14,21 90:16

91:4,10,15,16,23 92-3 14 93-7 96-11 96:21 97:7,16 98:6 98:11,17 99:4,9,13 99:17 100:10 21 101:21.25 102:6.11 102:24 103:9,16,20 104:9 105:8,16,22 105:24 106:2,14 107:5 10 12 14 20 110:10,22 111:6,24 113:4,16 114:2 116:11 118:23

119:2 120:10.16 121:11,18,24 122:2 122:14,21,23,25 123:1.1.11.12.19.20 124:7,11,20 126:15 126:16 127:9,23 133:17,21,22 134:2 134-4 20 135-1 3 139:3 145:8,12,17 145:23 146:4,9,18 147-3 25 148-9 10 148:24 149:6,11 152:7,12 160:13 165:24 168:16,17 170:15 171:17 172:9,17 174:12,15 174:17,22 180:2 181:14,25 182:5 184-13

turns 76:16 166:12 twice 180:7 two 21:1.1 22:15 41:14 50:4 58:23 59:19 60:1,16 69:17 70:4 100:19 101:14 101:18 111:4 115-24 139-9 11 16 150:16,20,22 151:3 151:12,15,20 154-15 168-11 171:11 173:17

type 60:22 101:2 102:2 151:22 types 27:4 29:2 30:12 31:14 52:16

70:23 154:12 typical 29:6.67:2 124:18 125:11

typically 16:15 29:8 u

**u** 11:16 **u.s.** 17:16 120:17 124:19 147:23 148:11 149:7 ultimately 155:14 160:22 uncertain 18:5 uncertainty 113:2 139:2 uncorrelated 171.25 undercounts 179:18 underestimate 133:22 underestimation 172:8 underlies 58:13 underlying 60:14 141:11 151:25,25 152:13 underneath 70:5 underreports 179:23

understand 5:18,19 7:15.20 12:14 14:15 61:7 64:5 73:6 85-18 87-18 94-16 100:2 135:23 138:11 141:20 144.20 24 171.13 172:23 175:2 understanding 55:6 65:10 100:18 137:9 understandings 161:12 understate 134:3

understood 6:11 unit 12:17.22 united 1:1 26:10.16 unobserved 150:19 unpleasant 10:12

[unrelated - votes]

unrelated 62:8 unusual 101.5 8 176:25 unweighted 40:18 upturn 69:23 upward 73:24 74:1 74:2 180:1 urban 79:17,21 urbanization 151:24 152:14 usage 164:16,25 167:8,8,14 168:3 use 5:23 24 12:10 52:19 57:24 90:6 93:12 95:2,7,9,21 99:24 101:7 115:19 115:20 122:6 129:22 130:19 132:4 140:10 143:17 149:20.21 150:2.7.9.10 153:14 164:2,4,20 165:9,14 166:4 183:6,6 useful 80:6 115:15 uses 13:18 126:14 159:19 usual 119:23

usually 109:17 149:19 v 1.11 43.23 45.14 47:7.22 49:12 50:19 170:14 valid 52:1 153:24 validity 11:2 70:5 value 141:18 143:25 vap 120:16 121:1,6 121:6,7 variable 161:9,17 161:18 variables 150:13,21

150:24 151:10.14 151:16.19 154:17 155:4,13 160:12,24 variation 10:17 111:3 112:7

varies 26:20 27:3 135:7 various 72:14 82:25 83-13 122-7 128-13 vary 17:3 26:23 vep 120:16 121:1 verbatim 185:10 version 157:14 versus 11:12 43:7 53:2 63:16 64:6 77:16 78:14 91:16 104.24 113.6 119:17 132:22 149:1 152:25 153:9 175:7 180:14 182:11 183:10.11 virtually 60:13 vision 98:4 vitae 3:16 42:6,13 vocke 1:12 vote 7:25 8:4,14 12:22 13:23 14:4,25 15:3 10:21 16:2 5 16:14.19 17:9.23 19:11 30:12 35:2,3 35:5 36:9,19,22 37:5,9 39:1,2 41:14 59:13.23 60:12 63:20 64:9,14,25 65:3.6.11.15.22 66:3 5 8 18 67:2 3 67:16 70:10,11 86:15 87:2,16,24 92:17.20 93:18 96:5 96:8,15 107:21,25 111:11 114:19 117:1,4 118:10 119:8.22.22 120:7 123:14 16 125:19 126:20,22 127:2,4,7 127:24 130:14 135-16 136-3 153-1 153:5,8 156:19,20 157:16,18,23,25

158:3.15.16 159:3

159:11.12.14.17.17

159:21 161:9,23

variations 110:22

175-14 19 176-7 10 54-10 59-22 63-18 64:16 65:2,21 66:2 176:11 vote's 66:22 66:7,17,19,21 68:2 voted 12:19 34:7 11 70:10 72:10 75:25 37:4,8,20,24 38:3,7 76:11 79:16 80:3,14 38:11,12,15,16,20 38:20 39:10,15 80:14 81:14,15,15 81:16 85:4 86:5,15 93:16 106:17 87:1,15,24 88:4,8 111-14 117-3 88-11 13 23 89-22 127:15,17 136:4 90:14,15 92:1,6,9 158:25 159:8,24 92:16,18,19,22,25 160:5 161:10 164:7 97:4 101:10 102:24 164:22 175:20 103:4,5,6,9,20 176:6,7,8 181:1 106:17 107:21 voter 3:18 8:11,19 109:2 115:15 12:1.18 15:11.12.12 116:16 118:8.11.14 15:25,25 20:4,7 33:11 37:15 57:1 118:15,17,21,22 119:4,6,16,17,21 62:14 63:3 64:6,7,8 65:4 67:10 12 14 15 123-24 124-23 125:2,19 127:6,12 68:22 69:5 71:8 127:18 128:1,2 74:10,11,13,19 76:3 76:7 17 23 24 77:4 129.3 131.25 90:8,14 100:21 132:20,20,23,25 103:20 117:5 133:14,24 134:1,12 119:10 126:13,18 134:14,15,21,21 127:3,14 128:3,10 135:3,5,6,7 136:12 128:14,16 129:6 136:13 140:20,24 135:17 136:1,16,17 141:25 142:2 146:7 137:6,10,11,12,13 152:25 153:12 137-14 18 23 157:18 158:2 3 138:14,14 144:6 159:11 164:2 165:25 166:12 148:10 149:5 158:24.25 159:1 168:9 172:5,7,16,18 166:19 174:13 173:1,2,5,6,7,14,15 175:10,18 176:1,21 173:17,24 174:2,2,3 176:23 177:1,5,7 174:16,18,19,20 178:1.5 179:6 175:7,7,9 178:4,7,9 voter's 67:1 178-24 24 179-9 10 voters 9:10,15 12:2 179:13,15,23 180:5 13:24 14:4,5,8,10 180:6,7,14,14,25 181-1 21 182-11 11 15:7 16:9 18:2 29:2 29:4,7,8,11,21 182:12,13 183:11 30:12 31:14 36:15 183:11,15 184:7

April 14, 2016

51:24 52:16,16

162:3.4.9 175:12.13

Page 25

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company (866) 448-DEPO

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company

(866) 448-DEPO

April 14, 2016 Page 26

180.9 184.1

wisconsin's 110:9

138:7 168:24

withdraw 48:14

witness 11:11,15 13:1 28:20 34:19

41:22 42:16,20

46:16 48:18 50:2 10

180:16

[voting - written]

75:12 124:13

treatments 65:6,23 66:3,9,18 67:6,17

trend 14:2 73:24

trending 111:24

74-2 81-4 111-25

trial 53:10 11 55:7

tried 120:6 128:8

141:12

tries 154:23

trindl 1:6

voting 3:17 8:5,24 9:2,9 10:11,18,24 11:1,17 12:5 13:14 13:22 15:8.8.15.15 16:10,11,17 17:8,23 17:25 18:16 35:23 35:23 46:8,10,11,19 51:10 62:9 64:16 67-5 11 11 68-22 69:4 74:18 76:15 78:9 91:4,16 92:4,5 92-24 93-18 24 96-4 96:7,11,14,17 97:8 97:14,16 104:3,3,9 115:23 116:24 117:14,18,19,21 118:20 123:5 125:8 128:1 144:19,22 145:7.15 152:1 156:4 163:9 164:2 5 164:17 165:3,15,25 166:5,13,20 168:8 168-21 25 169-5 172:1 181:12.23

182:21,25 vs 1:9 w 2:16 3:1 105:2 106:4 wait 5:3 21:13 waived 184:22 walk 126:6 129:16 34-11 35-1 5 37-4 8 37:20,24 38:3,7,11 39:11 59:14 102:16 108:11.25 109:6 111:5,9,11,11 146:25 153:12 walker's 38:21 119:24 want 15:22 17:18,18 28:3 32:23 35:10 57:5 61:7 64:5 73:6 77:17 79:22 80:10 80:10 85:17 87:20

88:21 90:5 93:4,4

101:12 102:14 134:18,19,19 154:21 155:14,16 155:25 156:2.3.22 156:24 157:4 158:11,12 159:4,5 165:9 170:3,10 173:20,23 176:13 vanted 65:12 128:24 130:7 155:17 wants 158-21 ward 12:23 washington 2:5 way 9:21 16:7 23:24 28:20 33:17 36:15 60:20.21 61:18.20 61:25 62:1 65:22 66:8 67:24 68:9 99.6 106.22 111.17 111:18 112:14 116:18 119:10 122-5 142-22 158-4 175:11

vays 28:22 65:3 66:2 70:24 76:14 141:23 we've 73.5 123.9 124:14 149:13 181:7 website 138:4 week 55:8 weeks 114:12 weigh 8:19 weighed 49:7 weight 40:17 41:2 86:23 90:19 weighted 40:23 41.11.86.17 weighting 41:5,7,15 132:3 170:14 171.24 179.5 weights 133:9 went 23:5 24:13 48:11 50:6 74:3,4 93:7,9 96:24 97:1 138:4 141:12

(866) 448-DEPO

western 1:1 wheel 133:7 white 80:13 81:14 81:15 82:20 83:7.12 85:4 86:5 87:15 88:3,11,13,25 89:5 89:14,22 96:4,11,14 96:21 97:4,15 123-11 128-3 136:10 159:11 164:1,7,21 165:3,13 165:24 166:3 21 168:8 172:7 173:15 174:7 178:8 whiter 29:14 64:1 whites 78:9 79:21 79-21 85-24 114-20 123:17 130:15 132:22 159:25 164:25 167:15.22 168:21 who've 118:15 125:12.12 wi 2:18 wide 10:17 wilder 1:6 win 27:8 35:12 winning 28:7

52:25 57:7 76:21 77:10 94:22 108:19 110:14 111:1 113:25 120:3 125:2 149:24 163:4 170:16 184:19 witnessed 124:2 women 47:6 won 109:25 110:7 wondering 113:21 word 53:12 65:7 70:18 85:21 words 15:23 28:14 85:19 157:22 work 7:3 13:1,5,9 13:11,12,17,18,25 23:25 74:11,13,15 74:21,24,25 95:14 95:23 103:16 104:2 134:5 147:24 wis 81:1 wisconsin 1:1,3,4 172:10 worked 180:16 2.13 12.2 17.8 18.1 31:11,12 55:20 57:1 working 56:8 58:15 63:5 71:25 125:25 works 138-16 72-15 73-1 9 81-2 93:2 96:5 97:14 171:24 98:6 99:12 100:11 world 35:9 36:4,13 101:11 104:8 109:2 36:14,18 worry 61:2 113-14-20 117-15 worse 122:18 123:8 would've 7:8 112:16 118:3 119:4 120:10 wrapped 53:12 120:15 121:11,15 write 24:1 44:10 46:22 47:24 51:13 122-14 123-3 23 127:2 137:9 138:17 138:22 142:2 149:6 54:11 58:12 73:7 162:11.15 164:2.7 writes 171:11 writing 4:23 171:16 166:1 168:7,21 177:9,21,23 178:11 written 172:25 178:18 179:19 Capital Reporting - A Veritext Company

[wrong - zero]

wrong 32:7 53:5 86:12 wrote 48:1 120:24

x 3:1.10

y 161:20,20,25,25 veah 4:11 14:14 24:15,15 57:7,7 68:7 74:8 76:4.6 85:12 87:3,7 89:11 93:23 95:4 97:1.12 99:11 100:13 103:3 104:12,21 106:12 110-2 3 117-24 120:18.22 131:21 137:7 140:19,21 143:7 144:8 146:21 147:1.7 149:14.24 153:7 154:3 155:9 156:15 160:17.19 162:6,6 169:6 172:3 177:2,16 178:6 180:17.19 year 87:23 96:8 152-5 years 62:16 63:13 64:17,18 100:19 105:16 148:23 149:6

younger 118:14 125:18,19

zero 160:8

Nolan McCarty, Ph.D.

37:4.8.20.21.24.25

39:10,18 40:7 47:6

38:3,4,7,8,11,19

April 14, 2016

votes 31:3 36:21

167:15

37:17 41:16 167:9

Page 27